This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 700,209

PROPERTY OF
University of
Michigan
Libraries
1817
ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

PROPERTY OF
University of
Michigan
Libraries
1817
ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

MEMOIRS

OF

SIMON EPISCOPIUS,

THE

CELEBRATED PUPIL OF ARMINIUS,

AND SUBSEQUENTLY

DOCTOR OF DIVINITY, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN;

WHO WAS CONDEMNED BY THE SYNOD OF DORT AS A DANGEROUS
HERETIC, AND, WITH SEVERAL OTHER MINISTERS, WAS SEN-
TENCED TO PERPETUAL BANISHMENT BY THE CIVIL
AUTHORITIES OF HOLLAND, FOR HOLDING THE
DOCTRINE OF GENERAL REDEMPTION.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE SYNOD OF DORT;

AND OF THE

SUFFERINGS TO WHICH THE FOLLOWERS OF ARMINIUS WERE EXPOSED,
IN CONSEQUENCE OF THEIR ATTACHMENT TO HIS OPINIONS.

BY FREDERICK CALDER.

"Simon Episcopius, the disciple of Arminius, was admired even by his enemies, on account of the depth of his judgment, the extent of his learning, and the force of his eloquence."—Mosheim.

"The Calvinists now punished with death those dissenters who had only followed the examples of the most renowned of Protestant reformers, by a rebellion against authority, for the sake of maintaining the paramount sovereignty of reason."—Sir J. Mackintosh.

NEW-YORK,
PUBLISHED BY T. MASON AND G. LANE,
FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AT THE CONFERENCE
OFFICE, 200 MULBERRY-STREET.

J. Collord, Printer.
1837.

2

BX
9479
.E64
1 2

PREFACE.

The subject of these memoirs lived in an age marked by fierce theological strife, as carried on between the followers of Calvin and Arminius. The prominent part he took in this conflict, with the extraordinary talents he displayed in defence of Arminianism, and the sufferings to which he was exposed in consequence of his attachment to it, have given his name distinction in the religious history of the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, as an extended account of him is only to be found in foreign publications, it is hoped that the following Memoirs, chiefly selected from such works, will not be unacceptable.

The design of the writer in publishing this work is, to present an impartial portrait of the character of Episcopius, which has been greatly misrepresented by bigoted and prejudiced authors. The Synod of Dort, by which he was condemned as a heretic, divested of his honours as a scholar, deprived of his office as a professor, and excluded from the ministry, for defending the doctrines of Arminius, is particularly noticed in the following pages; while his banishment from Holland, the imprisonment of his brother ministers, the prohibition of the religious assemblies of the Remonstrants, the fines inflicted upon some of them, the confiscation of the property of others, and the butchery of several, under the direction of the Dutch Calvinistic authorities, by a ruthless soldiery, when detected in celebrating Divine worship, are alluded to in the spirit of fidelity, and not of acrimony and bigotry.

The imprisonment of Grotius, and the judicial assassination of Barneveldt, the two great lay-defenders of the Arminian cause, it was thought were events deserving a place in a work professing to give a history of the affairs of the Remonstrants.

As the patron and able advocate of religious toleration, the reader will learn, in perusing these Memoirs, how much is due to the memory of Episcopius, on account of his labours in behalf of so important and righteous a cause.

The progress of religious opinion, since the Synod of Dort, in its approximation to the benevolent and expansive views of Arminius, both on the continent and in this country, has been noticed as contributing to generate a spirit of tolerance among various religious bodies; while the existence of that Christian sympathy in the various sections of the Church, manifested in the adoption of measures designed to bring the whole family of man under the hallowing teachings of the Gospel, is traced to the same cause.

The writer had intended to have appended to these Memoirs a translation of the Confession of the Remonstrants, as drawn up by Episcopius; but from the extent to which he has carried out his work, he is compelled, though reluctantly, to abandon this part of his design. Of this Confession, it has been said by a former translator in his address to the reader: "Touching the worth of this book as a summary of Christian religion, if Dr. Jeremy Taylor's judgment be of credit with thee, I am credibly informed he should prefer it to be one of those two or three which, next to the Holy Bible, he would have preserved from the supposed total destruction of books. A high encomium from the mouth of so learned and pious a divine!"

The Remonstrants, in their preface to this work, say, "It has been submitted to our brethren, not excepting those who are in prisons and dungeons, and carefully examined and compared by them in the fear of the Lord with the Holy Scriptures; and now, without one dissenting voice, is approved and set forth by us to vindicate our opinions, free ourselves from the charge of gross heresy, and maintain our innocency against the foul and calumnious accusations which have been brought against us."

As a substitute for this incomparable Confession, we have, in an appendix, given the opinions of the Remonstrants on the Five Points, as presented by them to the Synod of Dort, adding thereto, from the Confession, their sentiments on the subject of the holy Trinity, that the reader himself may judge whether, according to their own statement, they merited to be condemned as heretics, and banished their *fatherland*.*

The writer here begs leave to record his acknowledgments to Thomas Walker, Esq., of Stockton, for procuring for him, through the medium of his connections on the continent, several works necessary to enable him to compose the following Memoirs, as also to Mr. Nichols, of London, for the loan of several Dutch works presented to him by Arminian clergymen in Holland, after the publication of his translation of the works of Arminius.†

It is unnecessary to give the titles of several of the publications consulted in drawing up these Memoirs, they being scarce books in the Dutch and German languages; only the writer would remark, that he has principally obtained his materials from the *Leven van Simon Episcopius*, by Limborch, and the more enlarged edition of it as translated into Latin; and Bentham's *Hollandischer Kirch und Schulen Staat*, a singular and rare *mélange* of German, Dutch, Latin, and French, giving a history of all the sects existing in Holland shortly after the time of Episcopius, with the confession of each Church, a brief memoir of its most eminent ministers, and whatever was deemed interesting in its history, extending through seventeen hundred pages.

---

* Mosheim says they were thus treated for maintaining "that the love of God extends itself equally to all mankind; that no mortal is rendered unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree; and that the misery of those that perish comes from themselves."

† From a German correspondent the writer learns that Mr. Nichols' works have also found their way into Germany.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Persecutions of Charles the Fifth and Philip the Second.—Combination of the European Catholic monarchs to crush Protestantism.—Dutch courage.—Introduction of Protestantism into the Netherlands.—Character of Arminius.—His change of sentiments.—Hyper-Calvinism in Holland p. 11

CHAPTER II.

State of the militant Church.—Birth of Episcopius.—Early Education.—Dutch Church.—Episcopius is sent to Leyden.—Quits Leyden, after obtaining the degree of Master of Arts.—Preaches his first Sermon; and becomes acquainted with Uitenbogaerdt.—Epitome of the sentiments of Gomarus and Arminius.—Episcopius invited by the people of Gouda to be their minister 33

CHAPTER III.

Episcopius goes to Franeker.—Disputes with Dr. Sibrandus, and acquires fame by it.—Visits Arminius before his death.—Returns to Franeker, and again disputes with Sibrandus.—The treatment of the latter toward him.—Remarks on Episcopius' conduct in disputing with this professor 50

CHAPTER IV.

Constitution of the Dutch Church.—Episcopius' call to the ministry.—Intolerance of the Calvinist ministers.—Episcopius invited by the people of Bleiswick to become their minister.—His examination, and the opposition of the Calvinist clergy to his being set apart to the ministry.—Finally appointed minister of Bleiswick 75

CHAPTER V.

Episcopius' popularity as a preacher.—A remonstrance presented to the States of Holland by the Arminian clergy, containing the Five Points, from whence they obtained the name of Remonstrants.—Origin of the Dutch Confession.—Conference at the Hague—Episcopius invited by the magistrates of Utrecht to become their pastor.—Chosen Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden.—Commences his exposition on the second and third chapters of the book of Revelation.—False reports concerning him . . . . p. 102

CHAPTER VI.

Episcopius stands sponsor for his brother's child.—Treatment he met with in consequence.—Commences his comment on the First Epistle of St. John.—Visits Paris.—False reports of his holding correspondence with Peter Cotton, the head of the Jesuits 122

CHAPTER VII.

Character of Festus Hommius.—Charges Episcopius with Socinianism.—Episcopius refutes the charge before the curators of the University of Leyden. 140

CHAPTER VIII.

Polyander, the colleague of Episcopius, is jealous of the fame of the latter.—Treats him rudely.—Schism created in the Church by the Contra-Remonstrants.—Goulart deposed from his ministry, for refuting the doctrine of the reprobation of infants.—Superiority of Baxter's system to that of President Edwards.—Remonstrants commence holding separate religious assemblies at Amsterdam.—Riots occasioned by it.—Rem Bisschop's house plundered.—Reformed called Gueuxes 165

CHAPTER IX.

Venator charged with heterodoxy.—Conduct of Episcopius and Polyander in the affair.—Episcopius' interview with the Princes Henry and Maurice.—Preaches at the Hague.—Charged with heresy by the hyper-Calvinists, and testimony to his orthodoxy.—Maurice begins to manifest his intention of seizing the reins of government.—Measures preparatory to the assembling of the Synod of Dort.—Episcopius' oration in the University of Leyden, before going to the Synod of Dort 193

CHAPTER X.

Synod of Dort.—Object for which it was assembled.—Treatment of the Remonstrants.—Remonstrants cited to Dort.

—Appear in the synod.—Episcopius' oration before the synod.—Effect of the oration.—Conduct of Bogerman on the occasion.—Episcopius charged with falsehood.—The testimony of his brethren in vindication of his character . p. 233

CHATEER XI.

The Remonstrants protest against the legality of the synod. —Excitement occasioned by it in the synod.—Boldness of the Remonstrants.—They challenge the members of the synod to debate with them.—Commissioners sent to the Hague to inform the States of the proceedings of the synod.—The States approve of the conduct of its members. —Efforts made to terrify the Remonstrants into obedience to the wishes of the synod.—Dismissal of the Remonstrants from the synod, and the abusive language of Bogerman.—Conduct of the Remonstrants vindicated . . . 285

CHAPTER XII.

The Remonstrants allowed to prepare certain writings on the Five Points, to be presented to the synod.—Their courage in refusing to have any farther transactions with the synod.—Balcanqual's opinion of them.—Close of the sittings of the synod.—Feast given to its members, and medal struck on the occasion . . . , ... 310

CHAPTER XIII.

Barneveldt.—His character.—Arrest.—Trial and execution . 323

CHAPTER XIV.

Remonstrants sent for to the Hague.—Sentence read to them. —Episcopius' reply.—Departure of the Remonstrants into banishment.—Arrive at Walwick in Brabant.—Conduct of the Bishop of Bois-le-duc.—Episcopius publishes his *Synodi Dordracenæ Crudelis Iniquitas.*—Remonstrants publish *Acta et Scripta Synodalia Remonstrantium.*— The Confession.—Grotius' approval of it.—Mode of approval of it by the Remonstrant ministers vindicated . . 339

CHAPTER XV.

Persecuting spirit of the Calvinist ministers in Holland.— Eject all Arminian ministers from their offices.—Cruel treatment of the Remonstrants.—Their submission to it by the persuasion of their ministers.—Shot by the soldiers for assembling for religious worship.—Ministers preach during the winter upon the ice.—Administer the sacrament to their people in the streets.—Arminian ministers not allowed Christian burial.—Poppius and Niellius, two distinguished Arminian clergyman, imprisoned and threatened with the rack.—Conducted to the Louvestein.—Niellius sings on the road.—Bisschop summoned before the magistrates of Amsterdam.—Compelled to escape.—Returns.—Summoned before the consistory.—Excommunicated with several others.—Dr. Samuel Koster's pun on the occasion. —Review of the conduct of the Calvinist ministers in persecuting the Arminian clergy . . . . p. 358

CHAPTER XVI.

Episcopius at Antwerp.—Courted by the Catholics.—Writes on the worship of images.—The Spaniards endeavour, in vain, to induce the Remonstrants to join them against their country.—Noble reply of Uitenbogaerdt to the marquis of Queva on the occasion.—Episcopius in Paris.—Writes several works in defence of the Remonstrants.—His work on the freedom of the will.—Maurice's death.—Episcopius returns to Holland.—Writes in defence of the Confession. —Issues other publications.—Chosen minister of Rotterdam by the Remonstrants 392

CHAPTER XVII.

Seven ministers escape from the Louvestein.—Received by Episcopius.—Episcopius made Professor of Theology in the theological college of the Remonstrants.—Prepares his Theological Institutes.—Marries.—Writes several tracts against Popery.—His death and interment 416

CHAPTER XVIII.

Episcopius' character.—Judgment of several learned men concerning his works.—His love of toleration.—Capabilities as a commentator 428

CHAPTER XIX.

Cause of the failure of the Synod of Dort to effect the object designed by its convocation on the part of the Dutch Calvinistic clergy.—Cameron and his system.—Amyraut his disciple. Spread of his theory in France and Holland.—Adoption of it by Baxter in England.—Modern Calvinism. —Causes contributing to this milder system in the followers of the Geneva reformer.—Spirit of tolerance and unity among Christians 449

Appendix 473

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

In presenting a memoir to the reader, of the person whose name is prefixed to this volume, the writer cannot resist the inclination he feels to notice some of the most remarkable events in the history of the Netherlands, prior to the birth of this distinguished man. These were so deeply interesting, as to excite the attention of all Europe. They originated with the dark and suspicious spirit of Philip the Second, the bigoted monarch of Spain. This prince was prompted to direct a large portion of the forces of his empire against his Belgic subjects, for the purpose of destroying their liberties, and arresting the progress of the Reformation, which had found its way among them. They had previously been visited with the displeasure of Charles the Fifth, the father of Philip, for having dared to adopt a religious creed differing from that he wished to impose upon them. The early part of this monarch's reign was distinguished by the most tremendous forms of persecution, so that in the space of a few years, not less than fifty thousand* of his Flemish subjects were destroyed, either by the fire, the gibbet, or other modes of torture equally cruel and sanguinary. But instead of the spirit of inquiry being allayed by these cruelties, it seemed to be excited to greater activity, and the principles he thus endeavoured to extirpate, spread more widely in spite of these severities. "This fact being witnessed by Mary queen of Hungary, sister to the emperor, and governante of the Low Countries, she endeavoured to soften the emperor, and invited him into the Low Countries, to behold with his own eyes how persecution begat heresy. Charles wisely listened to her advice, and prudently gave up his severities."† But Philip, his son and successor, was incapable of being softened by any such circumstance, and while the spread of the doctrines of the Reformation seemed to be in proportion to the number of his victims, so his malignant heart burned with more intense feelings of cruelty, and more determined purposes of destruction. Hence, when one of his ministers represented to him the probability of a general revolt of the Belgic provinces, unless the severity of the inquisition were mitigated, he said, "I had rather be without subjects, than be a king of heretics."* The man who could utter this sentiment in cold blood, and Philip was rarely otherwise, was capable of the foulest deeds.

---

* Brandt says eighty thousand.

† Modern Universal History, vol. lii. p. 21. Grimesthorpe and Brandt. For this she was suspected by the pope of heresy.—*Brandt*, vol. i. p. 90.

To attempt to draw a portrait of this personage is no pleasing task; and if one half be true which is asserted of him by historians, the picture must be deeply shaded. Gifted with powerful talents, these were blighted and paralyzed by mistrust, which like a dark spectre haunted and spell-bound all his powers. Cold, cruel, haughty, and suspicious, he treated with studied reserve,† and imperious disdain, those who stood around him. Governed by selfishness, dissimulation, pride, and love of power; he was a stranger to pity, benevolence, and humanity. Religion with him was a mere superstition, and partook more of the nature of a moral disease, than that of a salutary remedy; and instead of spreading a bland and softening influence over his character, it only gave the force of principle to the purposes of a heart naturally cruel, and its sanction to his bigoted vengeance in favour of the superstitious dogmas of Rome. In his character was seen the incongruous association of the bigoted devotee, and foul debauchee.* With him, to murder in defence of popery, was piety; while to listen to the cries of a suffering victim, with any thing like the yearnings of pity, would have been deemed an unpardonable sin. Hence, when witnessing an *auto da fe*,† in the city of Valladolid, and sitting in sight of the unhappy victims, one of them, a Protestant nobleman, by the name of Don Carlos di Sessa, when being led by the executioners to the stake, called out to the king for mercy, saying:—"And canst thou thus, O king! witness the torments of thy subjects? save us from this cruel death, we do not deserve it." "No," Philip sternly replied, "I would carry wood to burn my own son, were he such a wretch as thou."‡ After which he beheld the horrid spectacle that followed, with that degree of composure and tranquillity which betokened the most unfeeling heart.§ Such a man, while he was the worthy husband of our own bloody Mary, was a tremendous being to have the lives, the fortunes, and the consciences of millions of subjects at his disposal: but such a man as their sovereign the ill-fated Dutch were compelled to receive, when the emperor, Charles the Fifth, presented him with his Belgic dominions.

---

* Universal History.

† His cold reserve and disdainful conduct, in one instance, was attended with singular effect. An inquisitor, who had been accustomed to be treated with that dignified freedom Charles the Fifth showed to his principal subjects, went to wait upon Philip; but being kept in the antechamber till his patience was exhausted, he at length pressed forward into the presence of Philip, as he was wont to do in Charles's time. But though his object was that of procuring another bloody placard, which must have been pleasing to the king, nevertheless, he received him with such cold and haughty disdain, that the inquisitor left his presence, gnashing his teeth with rage, and retired to the house of the President Viglius, where he fell down, became deranged, and died shortly after in a state of madness. So early did this haughty spirit of disdain show itself in Philip, that it is related of him, that even in his childish years, when his father on one occasion made his entry into Antwerp, and was received by the magistrates and people with profound respect, Philip beheld it all without once moving his bonnet, which so provoked Charles, that he gave the young urchin a box on the ear, in the presence of all the people, saying, "Did Vivas, your preceptor, teach you these manners?"

While in England, as the husband of Mary, he suffered the chief nobility to remain in his presence, without taking any notice of them. Burnet says, "His carriage was such. that the acting him and his Spaniards, was one of the greatest diversions of Queen Elizabeth's court."

---

* Marianna, a bigoted Catholic, says, "He was a prince remarkable for some virtues,—as liberality, resolution, vigilancy, abstemiousness in eating and drinking; but no less for many vices,—as lust, cruelty, pride, perfidiousness, and several others."

† Blasphemously means *an act of faith.*—*Brandt*, vol. i. p. 133.

‡ How far Philip showed himself capable of so hideous an act, the circumstances under which his son Don Carlos, heir to the throne, then present to witness the horrid scene, was put to death, too fatally proved. The melancholy end of this prince being so well known, it is unnecessary to insert the account here. Some modern writers, however, have attempted to soften down the atrocity of the act; but Marianna asserts, in his history of Spain, "There is no doubt that he [Carlos] was poisoned by his father's command." The crime of this prince appears to have been sympathy for the suffering people of the Netherlands, which was probably accompanied with a wish to share the government with his father, in some of the provinces of his extended dominions.

§ The Catholic princes of that period seem to have had a strong predilection for such sights and scenes. Hence Charles the Ninth of France, accompanied by his mother, stood at the window of his

In the character of a persecutor, he far surpassed in cruelty and resolution any inquisitor-general or his foulest familiars. The truth of this statement will be seen from the following fact: the Dutch, apprehending that the in-

---

palace, not merely to witness the slaughter of the Hugonots, but fired on those who were attempting to escape, crying to their pursuers, Kill! kill! kill them! In perfect keeping with this conduct, he subsequently ordered the execution of two Hugonot gentlemen, who had escaped the general slaughter. And he was so desirous of *enjoying* the *sight* of their *last agonies*, that as it was *night* before they were *conducted* to the *gibbet*, he commanded *torches* to be *held up* to the *faces* of the *criminals*.—*Hist. of the kings of France, of the race of Valois.*

In this conduct of Philip and Charles, we see the effect of fierce bigotry, generated by the unrelenting spirit of popery. But the following instance related of Sixtus the Fifth, has in it, if the phrase may be allowed, something horribly dramatic and ridiculous. A Spanish gentleman, having killed a Swiss guard, who had pushed him violently with the staff of his halbert, while clearing the road when the pope was going to mass, was instantly secured, and Sixtus ordered the governor of Rome to see that justice was immediately done upon the offender. The governor answered that he had given order for a process to be commenced against him speedily. "A process!" said Sixtus, "What occasion is there for a process in such a case as this? Don't talk to us of forms and ceremonies: it is our pleasure that he should be hanged before we sit down to dinner, and we intend to dine early to-day, being somewhat hungry." The ambassador of Spain, and four cardinals of that nation, waited upon his holiness, not to ask his life, for they knew that was to no purpose, but to desire his punishment might be changed into beheading, as he was a gentleman, out of regard to the honour of his family, and that of the whole nation. Sixtus having refused to comply with their request, addressed the ambassador sternly, and said, "Nevertheless, we shall show you some favour, and take care that the reputation of his family does not suffer, by the honour we shall do him in being witness to his execution." And indeed he never stirred from the window, till he saw him quite dead; and then turning round to those in the room with him, said, "Let them serve up dinner; we shall eat heartily now; this piece of justice has served for a whet to our appetite." After dinner, he said grace himself, and rising from table added, "Thanks be to God, we have eat very heartily to-day."—*The Life of Sixtus the Fifth, by Gregorio Lete*, fol. p. 282.

quisition was to be established among them, sent Count Egmont to the court of Philip, humbly to solicit that it might not be introduced into the Low Countries. Philip assured him, as he had frequently done others, that he had never projected any such measure; but at the very time of Egmont's stay at Madrid, he assembled a conclave of his creatures, doctors of theology, of whom he formally demanded an opinion as to whether he could conscientiously tolerate two sects of religion in the Netherlands. The doctors, hoping to please him, replied that he might, for the avoidance of a greater evil. Philip trembled with rage, and exclaimed in a threatening tone, "I ask not if I *can*, but if I *ought*." The theologians read in this question the nature of the expected reply; and it was amply conformable to his wishes. He immediately threw himself on his knees before a crucifix, and raising his hands toward heaven, put up a prayer for strength in his resolution to pursue, as deadly enemies, all who viewed that effigy with feelings different from his own.* To this statement the writer adds, If this were not really a sacrilegious farce, it must be that the blaspheming bigot believed the Deity to be a monster of cruelty like himself.†

Living in the present day, remote from the period when the dark spirit of popery, in all its plenitude of persecuting power, was brooding its plans to crush the civil and religious liberties of Europe, we have scarcely any sympathy with the people who stood aghast, confounded, and horror-struck, while they saw the Catholic princes combined to accomplish so foul a purpose. Of this league the prince of Orange was informed, while a hostage in France for the execution of the peace of Crambray, and accordingly gave notice of it to his friends in the Netherlands. "I heard," says this prince, "from the mouth of King Henry, that the duke of Alva had agreed with the French ministers on the means of exterminating all who were suspected of Protestantism in France, in the Netherlands, and throughout Christendom, by the universal establishment of an inquisition, worse and more cruel than that of Spain. I confess that I was moved to pity, by the thoughts of so many good men doomed to slaughter; and I deliberately determined to do my utmost for the expulsion of the Spanish army, the instrument of these wicked designs, from a country to which I was bound by the most sacred ties."*

---

* Lardner's Cyclop. vol. x. Netherlands. Brandt and Grimesthorpe.

† We may judge of the cruelties practised by Philip, and consequently of the character of the man, when even the pope exhorted him to greater moderation.—*Watson's Philip II., Appendix*, vol. iii, p. 345.

To pass in detail into a history of the proceedings resulting from the resolutions of Bayonne,† when the queen mother of Henry of France, in conjunction with Alva, engaged to effect their bloody purposes, would be foreign to the object of this work. Nevertheless, it cannot but be remarked, that when the foul massacre of the Protestants of France, on the fatal eve of St. Bartholomew,‡ filled all Europe with melancholy astonishment and horror, it lighted up for once the gloomy countenance of Philip with joy; who, on hearing the news of the slaughter of the Hugonots, was so excited, that his pleasure knew no bounds. How far Alva executed his part in this plan of extermination, may be learned from his own words. This monster, when quitting the Netherlands, after being foiled, and prevented from executing his sanguinary purposes to their full extent, at least enjoyed the malignant satisfaction of having to say, that he was leaving a country where, within the space of five years, he had by various means of torture put to death eighteen thousand persons. And yet Vargas, a worthy compeer in this work, and to whom he committed the chief business of slaughter, complained that the country was lost through foolish clemency.§

It was during this, and the subsequent periods of awful suffering, that Dutch heroism manifested itself in that patient endurance, and boldness of enterprise, to which nothing in the history of modern times can furnish a parallel.* The details of the sufferings of the inhabitants of Leyden, during the siege of that city, with their unflinching fortitude and resolution, are such as would excite doubt, had they not been given both by friends and foes. From a nation of merchants and mechanics, the Belgians, by their love of freedom, and of the rights of conscience, were converted into heroes. The ruin designed to be inflicted upon them by the tyranny of Spain, their unbroken courage hurled back upon that haughty nation; and the blow they inflicted upon their merciless despots so effectually shook the power of Spain, that she has not recovered from its effects to this day. It has been deemed necessary to make this statement, because it has been the practice of a certain class of writers to speak of this people with the utmost scorn and contempt; alleging that they are utterly destitute of every great and ennobling virtue.†

---

* Mackintosh's England. Watson, vol. iii, p. 345.

† Grimesthorpe.

‡ A striking picture of the horror this foul deed excited among the Protestants is drawn by Fenelon, the French ambassador at the court of England, in his account of his first audience after that barbarous transaction. "A gloomy sorrow," says he, "sat on every face: silence, as in the dead of night, reigned through all the chambers of the royal apartment: the ladies and courtiers clad in deep mourning, were ranged on each side; and as I passed by them, in my approach to the queen, not one bestowed on me a favourable look, or made the least return to my salutations."

§ Grimesthorpe and Brandt, 412.

One circumstance in their history should however never be forgotten, and especially by the English nation; that is, that this people stood in phalanx with Britain, in the hour of need, when Philip the Second concentrated the whole force of his vast European dominions, for the purpose of prostrating England to his sway, and banishing civil and religious freedom from these lands. With the devout and truly Protestant mind, the struggle of the Dutch at that period will be viewed as a species of agency, providentially governed, for the purpose of checking the despotism and cruelty of Popery, which aimed at extinguishing every thing like evangelical light and truth, which had been spread through Europe, by means of the Reformation.

The Germans first introduced Protestantism into the Netherlands. This arose out of the constant intercourse existing between these two portions of the emperor's dominions. To the spread of what were called the *new opinions*, this monarch was greatly opposed. This he evinced by publishing his famous edict in 1521, prohibiting the people of the Low Countries receiving or reading any books containing the doctrines of Luther; and consigning to death those who were found to hold the tenets of that reformer.* But in the face of dangers and death, the people embraced these doctrines; so that Philip, when he was invested with his Belgic territories, found that the inhabitants, to a great extent, had embraced the doctrines taught in the Augsburgh Confession.

---

* Grimesthorpe, 405. Watson.

† Take a specimen from the Modern Universal History, vol. xxxi, p. 3, "The Dutch are cold, phlegmatic, uninventive, and brutal; without a spark of genius or liberality, and wholly destitute of the true spirit of enterprise."

This man, who was not inaptly called "the demon of the south," revived the edict which Charles had happily, in the latter years of his reign, abolished; and he expressly commanded, that the burning and living burial, adopted by his father in his early zeal, should again be instituted in all their revolting forms. Under the direction of Alva and the council of troubles, subsequently named by the people the council of blood, this edict was attended to with savage ferocity, and the number of its victims was truly appalling. During the government of this ferocious being, nothing like public instruction seems to have existed. Nevertheless, the friends and followers of the doctrines of the Reformation were numerous. After the removal of Alva from the Low Countries, the Protestants became more bold, and began publicly to assemble for the worship of God, and to hear those doctrines preached which they had embraced. These meetings were usually held under the cover of darkness, and in the dead of the night. Some secluded spot, or densely dark wood, was the place of rendezvous; and thither the people hastened, at the peril of their lives, to hear the truth from the lips of some zealous preacher. As hostility to the tyranny and cruelty of Philip began to take deeper hold upon the minds of the higher ranks, and especially the nobility, the latter deemed it right to turn to their own account the love of religious liberty manifested by the middle and lower classes of the people. Emboldened by the silent sanction of some of the nobles, and encouraged by the avowed patronage of others, the people began publicly to assemble in great numbers, and hold their meetings in the open air. This was first done in the year 1566. These meetings were similar to those held by the Hugonots, in the year 1552, among the peasantry, in some of the provinces of France, and whimsically called by the French government, in an edict published to suppress them, "*ecoles buissonnières*," or hedge schools.

---

* Could it be supposed that so sage a monarch as Charles would allow the following statements concerning Luther to be inserted in this edict?—"It seems to us, that the person of the said Martin Luther is not a human creature, but a devil in the figure of a man, and cloaked in the habit of a monk, to enable him so much the better and more easily to bring the race of mankind to everlasting death and destruction."—*Brandt*, vol. i, p. 40.

An opportunity so favourable for more widely extending the doctrines of the Reformation in the Netherlands, was promptly taken hold of by the Protestants of the neighbouring kingdoms. This was especially the case with the followers of Luther and Calvin. But the former were by far the most numerous and successful, and spread their doctrines through the southern provinces, and especially in Flanders. The latter chiefly flourished in the eastern provinces. Congregations soon became regularly established; and some of the Romish clergy were won over to the reformed faith, and became zealous and bold advocates for the truth. Among these, deserving especial notice, was Herman Stricker, a converted monk, a native of Overyssel, and subsequently a powerful and intrepid preacher. This man frequently attracted an audience of seven thousand persons to hear him. Still there was a great lack of preachers to supply the increasing desire of the people for the word of life. This the Dutch felt the more painfully, because at the period we are alluding to they had no means of educating persons for the public ministry. They were, therefore, chiefly dependent upon foreign assistance for the ministry of the Gospel, and the administration of religious ordinances among them. Thus circumstanced, they availed themselves of the opportunity of sending their youth to universities founded in other countries, which had earlier renounced papal superstition and domination. Among the institutions of this kind, the one established at Geneva was then highest in repute. And hither, from the Low Countries, were sent young men distinguished for their talents and religious character, to be educated for the ministry. In this seat of learning, Beza taught what Calvin himself called the *decretum horribile.*

Among the persons sent to this university, during the period in which Beza filled the divinity professor's chair, was Arminius, whose name has since gone forth into all Christendom. Here it will be necessary to give a brief history of this extraordinary man, in order that the reader may more fully understand the ecclesiastical affairs of the Low Countries at this period, and the events which prepared the way for the subject of these memoirs to take so prominent a part in the religious controversies which then agitated the Netherlands. This is the more important, as these controversies gave rise to the famous Synod of Dort, the proceedings of which interested, not only the whole of Protestant Europe, but, to a great extent, the princes and theologians of the Catholic states and countries.*

Arminius was a man of rare talents, amiable temper, and eminent piety. He first studied at the university of Leyden, and afterward, by the liberality of the honourable senate of Amsterdam, at Geneva; where he soon acquired the reputation of a profound scholar, an acute logician, and an able disputant. For a brief period he left this university, to pursue his studies at Basle. Here he received particular marks of attention from the theological professor, Grynæus. On quitting this university to return to Geneva, though comparatively very young, it was proposed to honour him with the degree of doctor, at the public expense, which offer he modestly declined. After continuing some time at Geneva, he was recalled by his patrons to Amsterdam, for the purpose of being set apart to the ministry, in that city.

In the office of a preacher he acquired great celebrity, and was esteemed by his colleagues and the neighbouring ministers as an able divine, and a profound theologian. In proof of this, the well known circumstance which led to a change in his theological views, may here be briefly noticed. In doing this it will be necessary to ascend a little higher than the precise period when this event took place. An ecclesiastical history of Holland, now before me, published in German, by a person of the name of Bentham, in the year 1678, under the title of "*Holländis-*

---

* See *Anti-Synodica Johannis Malderi.* He was Catholic bishop at Antwerp.

cher Kirch und Schulen Staat," or, *A History of the Church and Universities of Holland*, adverts to this and the preceding events in so distinct a manner, that I have thought it right to translate and insert the substance of his statement in this place.

"In the early part of the preceding century, a person by the name of Hardenberg, residing at Emden, preached against the Romish Church. He soon attracted many hearers: several of whom embraced his sentiments. Among these was one by the name of Clemens Martenson. This man, in the year 1554, published a work, in which he treated of conditional election. This book was subsequently approved by Henry Antonides, professor of theology at Franeker; and had a very extensive sale, meeting with many admirers and advocates. This was especially the case in the province of Utrecht, where the ministers, without an exception, had received the sentiments it advocated. Those of Holland and Friesland, to a very great extent, had done the same. About this time, those who maintained the more rigid doctrines of Calvin began to spread more extensively in the Netherlands. Some French ministers, who had embraced the sentiments of this reformer, appeared in the Walloon provinces, where they strenuously held forth and advocated the doctrines of their master. As these persons had, by some means, secured the attention and support of the prince of Orange, they were emboldened to draw up, and present to the governante, Margaret, dutchess of Parma, a confession of their faith; in which they introduced the doctrine of absolute predestination. Immediately on the appearance of this confession, which was in the year 1567, it gave great offence to many theologians, who declared that the doctrines it contained on predestination were *innovations*, and publicly and zealously condemned them as such. Among those who came forward to declare their disapprobation of this confession, were the following persons: John Isebrand, preacher at Rotterdam; Gellius Snecanus, preacher at Friesland; John Holmann, professor of theology at Leyden; Jasper Koolhaes, of Leyden; Herman Herberts, of Dort; Cornelius Meinards, and Cornelius Wiggerts, of Horn; with several others. In the meantime, the doctrines of Calvin found many advocates; yet nothing was manifested like enmity or violence, by either party, on account of the other adopting opposite sentiments. No measures were pursued by either side, calculated to injure the other; and persons of both parties were appointed to public offices in the Church, without its being supposed, that the one was more eligible than the other, on account of his opinions. No person thought of branding another as a heretic, for difference of sentiment. And the people and ministers associated in Church fellowship in the most friendly manner, living in peace and amity with each other.

"But this happy state of things was not of long continuance. This arose from the circumstance of those who had adopted the harsher views of Calvin, at length charging the persons who had received and maintained the doctrine of conditional election, with Pelagianism; adding, at the same time, that they were not entirely purged from the leaven of Popery. This charge, publicly advanced, was followed by strong excitement against them, which painfully manifested itself from time to time. But it broke out more violently after James Arminius had adopted and defended the doctrine of conditional predestination. The circumstances which occasioned this talented man to embrace this sentiment, not only demand a place in this work from their singularity, but likewise from the fact of all those who have subsequently adopted the same views, being called Arminians, though the parties so designated may be averse to the appellation.

"Some persons at Delft, who maintained the doctrine of the sublapsarians, published a work entitled: '*Responsio ad argumenta quædam Bezæ et Calvini ex Tractatu de Prædestinatione, in caput IX. ad Romanos.* An answer to some of the arguments adduced by Beza and Calvin; from a treatise concerning predestination, on the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.' This book they sent to Martin Lydius, at that time professor at Franeker, who subsequently forwarded it to Arminius at Amsterdam, with a request that he would defend Beza against these writers at Delft. To perform this task, Arminius was the more ready, from the circumstance of his having recently returned from Geneva, where he had fully imbibed the sentiments of his former master Beza. But when he proceeded to an examination of the work, and deliberately weighed the arguments for and against the sentiments it contained, he at first began to waver, then to incline to them, and finally adopted the doctrines he had seriously sat down to refute."

Such is the brief sketch this writer presents of religious opinion, as it existed among the Dutch, immediately after the introduction of the Reformation among them, and up to the period in which Arminius adopted those sentiments which, after his death, were known in connection with his name.

It is evident, therefore, from this author,—who asserts his impartiality as an historian, and vindicates his claim to this character by saying, that he has avoided all reference to the prejudiced statements of the followers of Arminius and Calvin,* himself belonging to neither,—that the mild doctrines of Melancthon, which are the same as those of the Remonstrants,† had found their way, and widely spread through Holland, long before those of Calvin. This being the case, it follows that the *innovators* on public opinion were not the advocates of conditional predestination, but those who disseminated the doctrines of Calvin.‡ This fact is not sufficiently borne in mind, by certain writers, who find it convenient, while attempting to blast the fair fame of Arminius, to assert that he was a wild and headstrong innovator. Such conduct has undoubtedly been adopted, for the purpose of justifying the unrighteous and cruel proceedings of the Synod of Dort, toward those who espoused his opinions, and who were then, as now, known by the name of Remonstrants. So important do we think this view of the history of the early opinions of the people of the Netherlands, that we shall present the reader with one or two more extracts from other writers, on the same subject.

---

* And in farther proof of the justice of his claim to this character, he declares that he does not, like many, blindly follow such Calvinistic writers as Heinsius, Triglandius, Baudartius, Hoornbeckius, and Hornius; neither does he adopt the statements of the Arminians, Uitenbogardius, Brandius, nor those of the writers of the Epistolæ Remonstrantium.

† That is, on the subject of predestination. So says Brandt in the preface to his second volume, page 8. How far this statement is correct will appear from the following extract from Mosheim: "The Lutherans maintain that the Divine decrees respecting the salvation or misery of men, are founded upon a previous knowledge of their sentiments and characters; or, in other words, that God, foreseeing from all eternity the faith or incredulity of different persons, had reserved eternal happiness for the faithful, and eternal misery for the unbelieving and disobedient."—Vol. iv.

‡ This statement is equally applicable to Calvin himself, as it regards his introduction into Geneva, of what Mosheim designates his melancholy and discouraging doctrine of *eternal* and *absolute decrees*. His opinions on predestination, says this writer, were totally different from the most ancient Helvetic doctors, who were far from adopting the notion of an unconditional decree, that appointed some to everlasting happiness, and others to endless misery,

Vassor, who, in his History of Lewis the Thirteenth, gives a fair and extended account of the religious commotions of the Low Countries, and especially of the disputes between the followers of Arminius and Calvin, makes the following statement:* "The books of Erasmus, Melancthon, and Bullenger, being very much esteemed in Holland, these works had not a little contributed to make people relish the Reformation. The most sensible and understanding persons of the province, had a stronger inclination for the calm, moderate sentiments of these divines upon grace and predestination, than for the hypotheses of the rigid reformed. The sentiments of Melancthon were more in accordance with the primitive Greek fathers than those of Augustine, and being more ancient and rational than the latter, they were very generally adopted.

"Calvin, Zanchius, Beza, and others of the reformed divines, remained strongly adhering to St. Augustine's tenets; yea, some of them used harsher expressions.—Several, however, of these divines, having duly searched and examined the Scriptures, the opinion of St. Chrysos-

---

without any previous regard to their moral character and circumstances. And though the very learned Gerdes has attempted to prove that the sentiments of Calvin were the same with those of the ancient Swiss doctors, yet this excellent author may be refuted, even from his own account of the tumults that were occasioned in Switzerland, by the opinion that Calvin had propagated on the subject of the Divine decrees.—Vol. iv, 370, and 435. Indeed, Calvin prided himself in having departed from the notions then generally held concerning predestination. His persecution of Castalio, and Bolsec the ex-Carmelite, whom he occasioned to be exiled for opposing his opinions on predestination, we may notice afterward.

* I have not thought myself at liberty to alter the phraseology of this writer.

tom and the primitive Greeks appeared to them much preferable to that of Augustine. Nevertheless, the ministers who had studied religion by reading the works of Calvin and Beza, obstinately maintained the doctrine of their masters, insomuch that there existed some notable and substantial differences between the principles of the Churchmen and the magistrates. Both parties formed to themselves quite different notions of the thing they called *Reformation*, or *Reformed Doctrine*. The ministers, by these words, meant the *dogmas* or points of divinity explained by their great authors, inserted in the Confession of Faith. And some of these, always headstrong and fiery in upholding their opinions and prejudices, ever and anon railed at the magistrates, for their want of zeal for the sound doctrine; and the latter again complained that the others were a parcel of obstinate and inflexible persons, who would have every body implicitly and blindly embrace their particular sentiments.

"When the ecclesiastics summoned such as withstood the positions of Calvin and Beza touching predestination and free grace before the magistrates, as a sort of people who subverted the very foundation of the Reformation, the wisest and most enlightened among them demanded of these new upstart inquisitors if they meant to say that it was impossible to be a good reformed Christian without embracing the tenets of St. Augustine and his disciples. Ever since the reformation in Holland, those sentiments that are contrary to that doctor's system had always prevailed, and the states of Holland had not so much as approved of the Confession of Faith received in the Belgic Churches. Might not this be a sufficient proof that these wise, grave senators, believed that the compilers of this form had laid down some articles not absolutely necessary, which ought to have been expressed after a more gentle manner, less capable of giving offence to those who could not swallow all the private sentiments of the first reformer?

"Some able, learned divines of the Reformation maintained, and that publicly, the tenets of universal grace, of a power of resisting its operations, and of conditional predestination; and they were also taught by many learned Hollanders, and openly defended, before Arminius preached at Amsterdam. They had been read in public lectures at Leyden long before Gomarus had appeared against him. Their works are still extant. It is true, indeed, that some too hot-headed zealots stickled very much to blemish the reputation of the authors and their works; but the States of Holland always put a stop to their impetuous zeal. Some professors at Leyden assumed an entire liberty to teach in conformity with Melancthon's doctrine."*

Similar quotations might be made from other writers; but we shall only add to the above, one from the *Annales du Pais-Bas* of Grotius.† "When the people of Holland began to throw off the dominion and doctrines of Popery, they had no standard of faith, nor time to enter into disputes on points of doctrine. Each man, therefore, adopted his own sentiments, undisturbed by his neighbour. But after a length of time, when some young men, who had studied under the doctors of Geneva and Nassau, were allowed to officiate as ministers among them, they soon endeavoured to force their opinions on the Dutch Churches, and availed themselves of the first opportunity to accomplish their purpose. In carrying their measures, they attempted to pass a law in the classis,‡ that no persons should be admitted to the ministry, but those who had adopted the opinions they themselves had received. Not satisfied with this, they wished to exclude others who had long officiated as preachers, but whose sentiments were not in accordance with their own. These circumstances occasioned the other party to make frequent appeals to the States, asserting that their doctrines were such as had formerly been taught, and publicly sanctioned by the people, the States, and the ministers of the Churches."

The authority and praiseworthy interposition of the magistrates to restrain the querulous and dogmatical bearing of the divines of the Geneva school, though not invariably successful,* yet at least prevented these persons, for a time, from proceeding to persecute and excommunicate those ministers who disagreed with them on doctrinal subjects. But the civil commotions of the provinces, at a subsequent period, presented an opportunity too favourable to be allowed to pass unimproved by these

---

* Le Vassor's Lewis XIII.

† We translate from the folio edition in French.

‡ In 1571, they succeeded in getting a law passed that no one should be admitted as a minister till he had been examined, and had subscribed to the Confession. The terms of admission were narrowed and more rigorously enforced by subsequent decrees, in 1576 and 1586. Such as were to be admitted to the ministry they examined more strictly, and others, already in the ministry, whom they discovered to be erroneous in their doctrines, they censured and cast out. This is the testimony of a rigid Calvinistic writer.—*Clark's Marrow of Ecclesiastical History.*

---

* This will be seen from the treatment some of the persons met with, named at pages 21 and 22, who had opposed the doctrine of absolute predestination, either prior to, or at the period when it was inserted in the Confession. It is true, during the space of sixteen years, no measures were adopted against them, the defenders of this doctrine being too few to carry their purposes; but when they increased in numbers and influence, they proceeded to make use of their power to persecute them.

The case of Koolhaes may be first noticed. He engaged in a dispute with his colleague, Luke Hespe, who maintained, "that all persons who accompanied him to the Lord's table must be of his opinion in all points; and if they were not, he would neither break the Lord's bread with them, nor own them as brethren." Koolhaes published a pamphlet, in which he asserted, "that we are bound to own all them as brethren who agree with us in fundamentals, and are willing to live in peace with us, though they may not know as much as we do." He also refused to comply with a rule that required that those persons should not be owned as brethren who denied the doctrine of absolute predestination. He was excommunicated in 1582. This occasioned much disputation, which continued for many years. At length, by the interposition of some gentlemen, his clerical brethren were reconciled to him for a time on certain conditions; among these the following was one, "that he should declare that the Belgic Confession was scriptural, except in the matter of reprobation in the sixteenth article; and that he should consent to have his books suppressed, and should remain silent in reference to what he did not yet fully understand concerning the doctrine contained in that article, and should by no means maintain, *that the grace of God extended to all men, and to every person in particular*.* But although he expressed his assent to these terms, he was nevertheless subjected to many vexatious and malignant proceedings, before he was again acknowledged as a minister of the Gospel. Festus Hommius, of whom we shall have much to say hereafter, endeavoured to get him excommunicated a second time, in 1604, but the States prevented it.

Herman Herberts, in 1582, was charged with heterodoxy by some of his fellow ministers, and accused of publishing an Anabaptist book. The government deputed four commissioners to hear the charge and defence. The parties who accused him, not having evidence to substantiate their accusation, asserted that it was his duty to become his own accuser, and acknowledge the truth of their allegations. This was done in such a domineering tone, that the Heer Van Nispen, one of the commissioners, said to them, "*Gentlemen,*

* How these gentlemen could impose this condition on a man's conscience, in the face of the following statement, I cannot tell: "For the grace of God, that bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men." Tit. ii, 11.

I have read the history of the Spanish Inquisition, but I never was in a place where I saw so lively a picture of it as here." Herberts afterward consented to subscribe to the Confession, if they would allow him to interpret the sixteenth article* so that it might not be understood "to make God the author of sin."

He subsequently incurred the charge of heterodoxy, and the clergy were about to excommunicate him, but the magistrates of Gouda, to which place he had removed, interfered, and prohibited them from thus proceeding against him. Through their favour he was protected, and continued to proclaim for twenty-five years the doctrine of conditional election, at the end of which period he died in peace, with the devout resignation and fortitude of a holy Christian.

Wiggerts was suspended by the Synod of Alkmaer, in the year 1587, under the charge of holding heterodox sentiments on the doctrines of election, vocation, and the perseverance of the saints. The States were petitioned to suspend him from his office, but instead of so doing, they forbade the ministers to proceed any farther against him. Chafed and galled, however, by their subsequent bigoted and vexatious intermeddlings, he finally withdrew from them; and ceasing to preach in the churches, he began to exercise his ministry in a private house. The clergy complained of this to the States, saying he would lay the foundation of a new sect, and requested them to prevent his holding private meetings; but they refused to listen to their entreaties: he therefore continued to preach. The ministers grew clamorous, and insisted that he should cease preaching; but he was not a man to be awed by them, and when they threatened to excommunicate him, he told them they might do what they pleased, since he was no longer of their Church; he hoped every thing that was good from the States, but if it should happen otherwise, he was prepared to suffer for the Lord Jesus, who, he doubted not, would enable him to bear it faithfully. He however sent a challenge to those who had pronounced and condemned him as heterodox; offering to dispute with them, publicly, on the points on which they differed. This challenge was not accepted; and if it had been, it is most probable that the magistrates would have interposed to prevent the dispute taking place. They were particularly sensitive on those matters, and never suffered a public discussion to be held without their concurrence. This arose from

* We will present the reader with an exact copy of this article in French, in which language it was originally drawn up, in the year 1566:—"*Nous croyons que toute le Lignée d' Adam etant ainsi precipitée en perdition et ruine par la Faute du Premier Homme, Dieu s'est demonstré tel qu'il est, à sçavoir Misericordieux et Juste. Misericordieux, en retirant et suavant de cette Perdition ceux, lesquels, en son Conseil Eternel et Immuable, il a eleus et choisis par sa Pure Bonté en Jesus Christ Nostre Seigneur, sans aucun égard de leurs Oeuvres. Juste, en laissant les autres en leur Ruine et Trebuchement, où ils se sont precipitez."*

bigoted and restless spirits, to accomplish their designs of suppressing every opinion that was not in conformity with the rigid doctrines of Calvin and Beza. Of this conduct, Bentham, in the work already quoted, bitterly complains. This he does on the ground of the early labours of his countrymen, who, *in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft*, spread the light of the Reformation through these provinces. From such a people, he intimates, the followers of Luther and Melancthon deserved better treatment. The coadjutors of these great men, had been so far successful in spreading their doctrines among the Dutch, that the latter, on several occasions when addressing Protestant or Catholic princes, designated themselves Lutherans. And yet in several instances the divines of Calvin's school were subsequently unwilling to tolerate them.*

From these statements it will appear that the doctrines embraced and published by Arminius were not novelties in the Netherlands. They had long been received, and were generally taught, especially in Holland, which was

---

the apprehension that their frequency would agitate the minds of the people; and when they were permitted, with the hope of producing peace and unanimity among the contending ministers, they claimed the right of sending deputies to be present on the occasion. But of this they soon grew tired, at which the reader will not be surprised when he reads the following account: Saravia, one of the persons who assisted in drawing up the Confession, was allowed to dispute with Koornhert, who opposed it. Fifteen persons were appointed to preside on the occasion, namely, six out of the high council, one from the court of justice, and eight from the assembly of the States. Notaries were appointed to take down the arguments of each disputant. Saravia harangued for four days on the first question, and his statements filled many folio sheets. The rejoinder of the other was still longer. It was announced that there still remained forty-nine articles to be debated!!! The delegates stared at each other; for, allowing the disputants not to be more prolix on the remaining topics, which was somewhat doubtful, still the prospect was really tremendous, and was too much even for *Dutch patience itself*. The delegates quailed at the task assigned them, and the conference was broken up: and Brandt quaintly intimates, that having got safely out of the way, they left the disputants to pelt one another from the press.

* The intolerance of the Dutch or Calvinistic Church may be presumed from the fact, that no Lutheran house of worship was allowed to the States General of Holland and West Friesland.—*Lardner*, vol. xlvi, p. 180.

by far the largest of the United Provinces. It is true, his master mind might give them a more systematic form, but the great outlines of his creed were taught before he was known in Belgium. When, therefore, the semi-infidel Bayle* holds up this distinguished scholar and amiable man to public scorn, as a busy, restless changeling, in which he has been imitated by a modern writer, who says, "Arminius was one of those restless spirits that can never let orthodoxy slumber," the charge is false and amounts to a foul calumny.

Conduct of this kind, it is true, is to be expected from such writers, but how far it is just and honourable is another matter. Without any fixed or influential religious opinions themselves, and being perfectly indifferent to such subjects, they nevertheless claim the right of carrying their notions of optimism into these matters so far as to condemn the man, whose conscience prompts him to adopt and divulge an opinion that may not be sanctioned at the time, either by the governors of the state, or the mass of the people. But the consequence of such a theory must be obvious, and if correct, would equally apply to the founder of Christianity as to any of his followers, in every period of the Church's history. And then what becomes of the noble band of martyrs of this and other countries? Why, instead of rendering homage to them, as to some of the loftiest spirits that ever adorned the Christian name, and who, when standing in the dungeon, or bound to the stake, were cheered while looking through the vista of time, anticipating the effects of their heroism, in inspiring others with courage in the day of conflict and of suffering, they are, according to the creed of these gentlemen, to be contemplated "as restless spirits, who could not let orthodoxy slumber," and therefore only to be remembered with contempt and reproach.

---

* This man seems to have had the most bitter enmity against Arminius, which originated with the latter advocating the doctrine of the freedom of the will, and consequent responsibility of man, opinions Bayle abhorred. His assumption of the name of a predestinarian Christian, in conjunction with his gross vindication of Calvin's sentiments, will be received with no greater approbation by the followers of that divine, than the declaration of Dr. Priestley, when he states that he can assure his Calvinistic friends, that his views on the freedom of the will are precisely the same as those of President Edwards of America. Bayle, in his defence of Calvin against Arminius, says it is utterly impossible that he could refute the hypothesis of Calvin, "which admits that God will have men to commit sin;" and then asks, "Where is the difference between God permitting and being the author of sin?" But while these two writers claimed brotherhood with the followers of Calvin on this subject, it is but fair to state that their object was very different from that of the Geneva reformer. These gentlemen denied the freedom of the will to get rid of man's accountability, and liability to punishment for his actions. I remember many years since, conversing, in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, with an advocate of Dr. Priestley's sentiment on necessity; when I asked him what he would say to a deed of murder, he replied it was an inconvenience —an act to be punished by the magistrates; but would not be viewed as an evil by God: the person committing it being under the influence of circumstances over which he had no control, which *necessarily* superinduced a class of motives that led to the deed. He added, at the same time, that he who gave alms acted under similar circumstances, and was equally as undeserving of praise as the other of blame.

The mistake of such writers on these subjects must be traced to the circumstance of their looking at religion merely as a piece of state machinery, and only valuable as an instrument for governing the minds of the many for political purposes. This being the case, they are prepared to condemn every thing like the boldness of decisive acting in religion, which does not accord with the dictates of worldly prudence and worldly policy. But, with devout and serious persons, religion is contemplated in a more important point of view, and man is seen as a responsible agent, who is as accountable for his opinions as for his conduct; and therefore, for any one, professing to be its subject, to pay public homage to that which his conscience denounces as wrong, is held by them as a species of mental apostasy, as degrading to him as it is offensive to God, *who requires truth in the inward parts*. That such were the views of Arminius on matters of religious opinion, his unspotted character, and well known probity, fully testify. And we might put it to such gentlemen themselves, to say whether his conduct, in avowing what he believed to be the truth, does not appear more honourable, than that of a certain dignitary of the Church of England, who, differing from the creed of the Establishment, justified himself in letting "*orthodoxy slumber,*" by saying he could not afford to keep a conscience. Had the subject of these memoirs, and his fellow sufferers, acted as this dignitary, they might have retained their offices, but would have defiled their consciences, and their memory would have gone down to posterity with the contempt such conduct justly merits.

The person who views the circumstances which led to the change of sentiment in Arminius, in connection with a knowledge of his character, must see with how little justice he can be held up as a fiery theological zealot. Amiable and unpresuming, he was diverted from the usual course of his studies by the intermeddling of others; and had he not thus been interrupted, he might have remained esteemed an orthodox divine to the end of his life, even by those who subsequent to this event designated him a heretic. But so it was not; and the writer of these pages places it among the most interesting of religious events, and second to none but the Reformation, that this great man was prompted to examine and test the doctrines of Calvin by the light of Scripture, and the writings of the fathers of the first three centuries. Of these, Mosheim says that "every one knows that the peculiar doctrines to which the victory was assigned by the Synod of Dort, were absolutely unknown in the first ages of the Christian Church." If this might be said of the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, with how much more justice might it apply to the Calvinism of the college of Geneva. But the most important result arising out of Arminius' adoption of the system of the earlier ages of the Christian Church, is the tone that its diffusion has given to Christian zeal, benevolence, and philanthropy. For a creed, merely as a creed, the writer would not contend. Even truth, if it enlighten the mind, without changing the heart, will not contribute to the salvation of its subject, though it may add to his condemnation. Whatever others may think of the system of Arminius, the writer attributes to its bland and expansive character all the gracious excitement which exists at the present day, in various sections of the Church, manifested in the attempts now being made to evangelize the world. His opinion may be wrong; nevertheless, it is the result of calm deliberation; and therefore he has been prompted to prepare the following memoirs, for the purpose of presenting to the notice of the reader the history of one of its most able and eloquent ADVOCATES.

CHAPTER II.

ALTHOUGH it is the lot of the Christian Church to be continually exposed to conflict and suffering, yet these are not invariably of the same character, nor marked by similar danger or duration. Sometimes it is attacked by the fury of persecution,—then darkened by the clouds of error,—now rent and distracted by dissensions and schisms,—and not unfrequently assailed by all these evils together. And if happily exempt from their influence, though but for a brief period, then the ease and enjoyment of worldly prosperity too fatally tend to produce that formality and indifference, the frequent attendants of affluence and repose. But the beneficent Creator and Preserver of men, ever intent upon the well being of his creatures and the safety of his Church, has always provided for its defence; that, amid the dangers to which it is exposed, it may continue steadfast in the faith, and overcome whatever is intended to effect its destruction. So that if any of its members fail of the enjoyment of salvation, or become inconstant, and apostatize, this is not to be attributed to the want of benevolence or fidelity in God, but solely to their own carelessness and indifference.

Among the means God has appointed to effect the safety and well being of his Church, we must rank the bestowment of those eminently gifted men whom he has raised up at different periods, and variously stationed among his people. Richly endowed with the spirit of vigilance, piety, and fidelity, they have been peculiarly qualified to meet the dangers of the age in which they have lived. Standing like bulwarks, they have defended the Church under the most severe temptations and conflicts. At one period exhibiting a model of endurance and constancy amid persecution and suffering; at another expelling error by the evidence and force of truth; now allaying the spirit of dissension by a bland and conciliatory temper; then hushing the storms of contention by the suggestions of modesty and meekness; and finally, by self-denial and renunciation of the world, with all its glare of pomp and pleasure, they have presented to public notice the hallowed power of piety in all its attractive forms.

The effects of their labours, though highly beneficial to the age in which they lived, throwing a halo around it, have nevertheless not been confined to that period, but have cast a light on the distant of the future, the blessed results of which have remained long after they have ceased to exist upon earth. Among these distinguished individuals Episcopius may justly be considered as holding an eminent rank. For if we consider him in connection with the difficulties of the time in which he lived, the character of the controversies in which he was engaged, the splendid talents with which he was endowed, the productions of his pen while comparatively a youth, his constant resistance of every species of attack on the Church, with the piety of his conduct to the close of his life, proving that his actings were generally under the fear of God,—it must be admitted that he appears before us not only with those claims which entitle him to be placed among these eminent persons, but also as being distinguished with that superiority of mind which must command our homage, and that excellence of character which ought to prompt us to imitate his virtues. With the desire, therefore, of glorifying God, by inducing others to tread in his steps, I have deemed it proper to compile a brief memoir of this highly gifted man, in which will be exhibited, not only the most striking events of his life, but also the principal occurrences of the age in which he lived, and was called upon to take so prominent a part.

According to the entry of his birth, found in the registry at Amsterdam, Simon Episcopius was born in the year 1583, on the eighth of January, and baptized on the sixteenth of the same month. His father's name was Egbert Remmetzen Bisschop; his mother's, Geertruyd Jans. They were both of honourable and unsullied character, and as such were highly esteemed. Their attachment to the doctrines and institutions of the Reformation was genuine, and their avowal of it decisive, though attended at that period with great peril and danger in our fatherland.* They were married in the year 1572, and had a numerous family; namely, seven sons and three daughters. But the whole of these, save Simon and his two brothers, Rembert and Jan, died, either in their infancy, or at an early period of life. Simon was the youngest but one of the seven sons. Of Rembert and Jan, we shall have occasion frequently to speak in the subsequent part of these memoirs.

---

* The reader will admit this statement to be true, when he remembers that this was the very period when Alva exercised his awful cruelties upon the Belgians. This wretch was accustomed to say, that this people dwelt nearer to hell than any other, and

From his childhood, Simon gave decisive proofs of a viorous understanding and capacious memory, accompanied with an ardent desire to obtain information, which was evinced by his availing himself of every opportunity of reading such books as were accessible to him, so that he was seldom seen without one in his hand. The circumstances of his parents were not affluent; and from the number of their children, they had some difficulty in providing for them in a respectable manner. Thus being

---

sportively stated his right to send them there. The atrocities he committed almost exceed belief. Grimestone states his reluctance to enumerate them; nevertheless, he asserts that his cruelties were so unnatural and ungodly that neither Pharaoh, Nero, Herod, nor any heathen tyrant could ever have invented greater. He then proceeds to detail them through upward of five folio pages. Mr. Grattan, the writer of the History of the Netherlands, in *Lardner's Cyclopædia*, says, "History exhibits no horrors parallel with those committed at this period in the Low Countries."

One of the practices of Alva was, to set spies in the corners of the streets to observe the countenances of the people, and if any one assumed a serious aspect, it was sufficient to subject him to the charge of Protestantism, and he was instantly hurried to slaughter. *Brandt*, vol. i, p. 280.

One horrid effect arising out of this system of persecution and murder under the name of religion, was that of extinguishing all the kindly sympathies of brotherhood and humanity: in proof of this the following facts may be adduced:—Two brothers meeting in the market place of one of the cities of Holland, during a contest between the Papists and Protestants, the one asked the other where he was going; he replied, to join the Protestant party, and I, said the other, to join the Catholic: "If you meet me in conflict do not spare me, for I shall not spare you." In the winter of 1569, a Protestant being pursued on the ice by an officer of justice, under the direction of a popish magistrate, the officer fell, and the ice being thin he was likely to be ingulfed in the water: the other, perceiving the danger of his pursuer, returned, gave him his hand, and at the risk of his own life saved his enemy's. The officer was half disposed to let him go, but the magistrate threatening him, he therefore secured him, and he was subsequently burned as a heretic.—*Brandt.*

without the means, it was not their design to give Simon an education that would fit him for any of the learned professions; but from the earnest and continued entreaties of his eldest brother Rembert, joined with an offer on the part of the Heer Cornelius Benning, formerly one of the burgomasters of the city, to assist in paying the expenses of his education, they were at length prevailed upon to devote him to the pursuit of literature. He was accordingly sent to the public Latin school, of which Peter Veckemannus was at that time the rector or master. Here, in a very short time, he made such rapid progress in the acquisition of the Latin and Greek languages as to attract the special notice of several learned and distinguished gentlemen; so that it was deemed proper to propose him to the notice of the venerable council of the city of Amsterdam, in order that he might be received as an *alumnus** or *voesterling* of the city. To this proposal, his parents, in the first instance, were very much opposed; but yielding at length to the council and entreaties of Joannes Kucklinus, and Jacobus Arminius, both eminent ministers then residing at Amsterdam, he was accordingly received by the honourable senate as one of their *alumni*, who subsequently showed him the strongest marks of their esteem and regard.

Having passed through the usual course of studies taught in his native city, in the year 1600, he was considered by the honourable curators of the school as being fully competent, and deservedly meriting, to be sent to one of the universities, where he might farther pursue his studies in the higher branches of literature. It was accordingly resolved, that he should be removed to the university of Leyden, belonging to their high mightinesses the States of Holland and West Friesland.

To this account, as given by Limborch, we can but add, that although this circumstance was highly honourable to the talents and character of Episcopius, yet the case was not of rare occurrence; it having taken place with Arminius some years before, and others of similar capabilities and application. Indeed, the equality existing among the ministers of the Dutch Church, with the limited salaries allowed them by the state, presented no inducement to families of aristocratic dignity and ample wealth, to train up their sons for the office of the sanctuary. The pulpit was therefore usually occupied by persons from the middle ranks of society; while an instance of the son or relative of a noble family becoming a minister, was so rare, that when it did occur, as in the case of Taffinus, formerly a minister of the Walloon Church at Amsterdam, it was considered a circumstance so extraordinary, that Brandt could not allow it to pass without noticing it more than once. By the unprejudiced and uninterested, the excellency of such a system must be allowed. For while it presented no temptations to the profane and indolent, to enter the sanctuary for wealth, yet it opened the path of honourable distinction to the man of talent, diligence, and serious deportment. Destitute of the consideration which birth or wealth commands, the Dutch minister, to obtain eminence, found it necessary to become the industrious student, faithful preacher, and diligent pastor. The habits consequent on such a course, gave sedateness to the character, and mental superiority to their subject, and he reaped the advantage of them in the enjoyment of that esteem ever attendant on the ministerial office, when sustained with learning, probity, and piety. This circumstance accounts for the clerical character being more venerated in states where the revenues of the Church are comparatively limited, than in those where its ministers are supported with princely fortunes, and in too many instances fall the victims of princely vices. Such conduct not merely occasions disesteem of the clerical office, on the part of the people, but likewise prepares them to scoff at religion, and become the subjects of impiety and deep-rooted infidelity.

---

* I have left this word untranslated; adding, as Limborch has done, the Dutch substantive, *voesterling*, which is like our word *foster-child*. In the review of the report of public education in Prussia, in 116th No. of the Edinburgh, I find it invariably untranslated.

The results of the ecclesiastical arrangements among the Dutch were very evident in the talent, scholarship, and commanding influence of the Belgic clergy. This was especially the case from the early part of the sixteenth to the middle of the seventeenth centuries. Such a crowd of distinguished scholars in the same period, Bentham justly says in his *Schulen Staat*, never adorned any country. The Latin was spoken by them with the same facility as their vernacular tongue; while several of them could converse in Greek, with ease and fluency. Among this race of learned men, the subject of these memoirs was one of the most eminent.*

We must now resume Limborch's narrative, and follow Episcopius to the university of Leyden, where he prosecuted his studies with great eclat and advantage. At the time he entered this seat of learning, John Kucklinus was the regent. This gentleman, during his residence at Amsterdam, where he performed the duties of a minister, formed an intimate acquaintance with the parents of Episcopius. Our young student had not been long at Leyden, before he suffered the painful and irreparable loss of his greatly esteemed and venerated father, who fell a victim to a plague which awfully raged in Amsterdam, in the year 1602, and carried off many of the citizens to an untimely grave. But although its ravages were wide and fearful, and continued for several months, yet it is strikingly singular, that from its commencement, which was early in the year, to the seventeenth of August, not one of the burgomasters, schepens, treasurers, guardians of orphans, ministers, elders, deacons, almoners or visiters of the sick, rectors, and teachers of the schools, had fallen a victim to it. This circumstance was especially noticed by Arminius, who sent information of it to his particular friend Uitenbogaerdt, adding at the same time that if it were not to be considered miraculous, yet at least it ought to be regarded as a special mark of the providential interposition of God toward the parties.*

---

* In speaking of this host of superior men, the writer is aware that he opposes an opinion which is very current not only in England, but has likewise obtained on the continent. Bentham bitterly complains of the French in his day, 1697, for speaking so contemptuously of the Dutch; and in vindicating them from the ignorant charges of this frivolous people, brings forward a list of 133 distinguished persons, who during the space of 200 years ornamented the Netherlands. This list does not comprehend the Dutch painters, but the names of poets, philosophers, physicians, professors, preachers, philologists, jurists, historians, and persons of other professions. To prove that his statement is correct, he first marks who, and how many were born in each province; the period in which they lived; and then gives a brief memoir of each, with an account of his publications; concluding the whole by asserting that no nation, in the same period, has produced any thing equal to this amount of talented and extraordinary men. With such a statement before him, what will the reader think of the following declaration of the editors of the Modern Universal History: "Holland has produced poets, painters, and sculptors; wits of the first class have started up, like grapes in *Siberia*, contrary to the usual course of nature; but these are phenomena, which appear as comets, only once in a century, to excite the astonishment of mankind."—Vol. xxxi, p. 3. Sir John Carr says, in his late Tour through Holland, "that an English merchant would be astonished at the wonderful arithmetical attainments of stripling clerks, in any Dutch counting house, and the variety of languages they speak."—p. 11. This statement has been reiterated to the writer by a gentleman, who, as a Dutch merchant, has occasionally resided in Holland, and witnessed the fact stated by Sir John Carr. If the French, who sneer at this people, be compared with them as linguists, every man who has travelled in France knows to which the palm would be given. And perhaps the same remark is applicable to the English.

Episcopius had scarcely ceased to feel the pain occasioned by the death of his father, when he sustained a second loss in the death of his mother. As a man of sensitive and amiable feelings, these successive strokes affected him most acutely. Nevertheless, amid these domestic calamities, he steadily held on his way as the diligent and laborious student whose indefatigable zeal and patient perseverance were singularly crowned with success.

Having become perfect master of Greek and Latin by an extensive course of reading of the most celebrated authors who had written in these languages, he subsequently entered upon the study of philosophy, to which he applied himself with the most unwearied industry for the space of three years, in order that he might be thoroughly acquainted with it, not only in its principles, but in all its branches and dependencies. At the lapse of this period, he began to study theology, an acquaintance with which was the final object of all his literary labours. It is true his deep solicitude to become most thoroughly versed in all the departments of philosophy occasionally led him to turn his mind to it, nevertheless his theological studies were deemed as principally entitled to his attention, and were accordingly pursued with the most intense application.

---

* Epistolæ Præstantium Virorum, p. 105.

As the time was approaching when Episcopius must quit this seat of learning, having studied there nearly six years,—the period allotted for college residence to students in the universities belonging to their high mightinesses the States of Holland and West Friesland,—he therefore deemed it necessary to have recourse to the measures adopted in such circumstances, to obtain the degree of Master of Arts. Having passed the examinations usual on these occasions, he was publicly honoured with this distinction on the 27th of February, by the professor of mathematics, Rudolphus Snellius; and on the 10th of the following April, he also received from John Kucklinus, regent, and Peter Bertius, under regent of the university, the most honourable and flattering testimonials of diligence, learning, piety, and purity of conduct.

He now devoted himself wholly to the study of theology, in which he had already made rapid advances. He was constant in his attendance on the lectures of the professors, Francis Gomarus, Luke Trelcatius, and James Arminius. In the private disputations instituted for the purpose of exercising and improving the talents of the students, he evinced, during the discussion of the theses or propositions as they are called, a degree of knowledge, the fruit of his diligence and application, accompanied with those evidences of superiority of mind, which pointed him out as far excelling any of his fellow students. This superiority soon attracted the attention of the honourable curators and professors of the university, and he was pronounced "every way worthy," though comparatively young, to sustain the office of the ministry.

The fame of his extraordinary talents soon found its way to his patrons, the honourable senate and magistrates of Amsterdam. They therefore expressed great anxiety to witness some proof of his native endowments, his diligence, and extensive acquisitions. It was accordingly determined, that he should treat upon some subject before them. The day appointed for this was the 11th of June, when in the New South Church he delivered a discourse on Rom. viii, 14. On this occasion were present the following gentlemen:—Burgomasters Dirck, Peter Hooft,* and Benning, with several members of the council and a large concourse of people who assembled to hear a young scholar of whom the professors of Leyden had made such a favourable report.

---

* This gentleman and his son, both Arminians, make a very conspicuous appearance in Dutch history. Of the latter, Brandt

Of the result of Episcopius' first appearance in public, Limborch gives no account. But it may be fairly supposed that it was highly creditable to himself, and produced a strong impression on the minds of his audience. This appears the more probable, from the fact of its being stated in a subsequent paragraph that he this year became acquainted with Uitenbogaerdt. The circumstance of his

---

says he was one of the noblest geniuses that ever put pen to paper in our language, and is very famous for his history and poems. The memory of the father, here named as a hearer of Episcopius, in order to decide upon his qualifications for the ministry, Brandt has honoured, by inserting a portrait of him in his Dutch history of the Netherlands. In the lines at the foot of the plate he is designated a *Christian Cato*, for having opposed the machinations of Leicester, when he wished to enslave and rule Holland by his despotic dictum. The poet, playing on his name *Hooft*, which means *head*, says it was full of mental power,* which was ever used to secure the well being of the city, where he acted as an upright and virtuous magistrate for upward of thirty-five years! He was a great advocate for liberty of conscience. This was the front of his offence to the contra-remonstrants; and he with others of his fellow senators, who were inclined to the doctrines of Arminius, were put out of office by Maurice, after he had made up his mind to seize the government. When this successful soldier appeared in the council chamber of Amsterdam, and had, by the support and presence of his troops, which he every where took with him, annulled the rights and privileges of the city, and displaced the magistrates, Hooft, who it appears was worthy the designation of a *Christian Cato*, turned round to his brother magistrates and said, Will no person speak? and none daring to do it, Hooft rose and said, that regard to his his oath and conscience compelled him to say something; and courteously asking leave of his excellency so to do, which was granted, he then, in a prudent but firm tone, remonstrated with him on the injustice of his proceedings; and begged him not to trample upon the rights of the city, assuring him that he and his fellow senators, who thought with him, were as good patriots, and as great enemies to the Spaniards, as the contra-remonstrants or Calvinists. Maurice was so far awed by the dignity and independence of this venerable man, that he took no measures of severity against him for thus opposing him. A similar act on the part of Barneveldt Maurice occasioned to be punished, in the day of his power and despotism, with death. In this case, however, he only said, "It must be so now, father: necessity and the service of our country require it."

* Literally full of brains.

being thus favoured with the acquaintance and friendship of this eminent divine was an event in the history of Episcopius' life worthy of being noticed by his biographer. The splendid powers and eloquence of this man procured for him the designation of the Dutch Cicero. He was chaplain to Prince Maurice and preacher to the court of the Hague, and was in the Church at that period what Barneveldt was in the state,—*the ruling spirit.* Both these gentlemen were called to suffer on account of their religious opinions as being opponents of Calvinism. The one lost his head, and the other was sent into banishment.* As we shall have frequent occasion to mention these persons in the subsequent part of this volume, we shall not detain the reader at present by any reference to their history. Limborch, in his narrative of Episcopius, proceeds to say:—About this time began to break forth between the two professors, Gomarus and Arminius, those painful disputes on the subject of predestination which subsequently agitated the whole of the Netherlands. After the death of the professor, Luke Trelcatius, who had been their colleague, these disputes became more violent. Writing for the Dutch people, Limborch did not deem it necessary to refer to that part of the personal history of Arminius which relates to his appointment to the office of professor of divinity, because they were well acquainted with it. As this may not be the case with the reader of these pages, it is thought proper to allude to some of the circumstances connected with his appointment to this elevated station.

---

* In the second volume of Brandt's work in Dutch, now before me, a portrait is given of Uitenbogaerdt, accompanied with some lines of poetry, of which the two first refer to his eloquence and his banishment: we shall give them:—

Gÿ Christen Cicero, gÿ twede Guldemondt,
Dien't Kerk en Staet krakkeel in ballingshap verzondt.

Thou Christian Cicero, thou second golden mouth,
Whom Church and State contentions sent into banishment.

The reader will recollect that the designation of golden mouth refers to the name of Chrysostom, which is derived from the two Greek words *χρυσουν golden*, and *στομά mouth*, which name he acquired in consequence of his powers of oratory, and is here alluded to to show how highly the Dutch esteemed the eloquence of this man.

Mr. Nichols has promised, if he be permitted "to see many days," to give the life of Uitenbogaerdt to the British public. To this the writer would add, if time and opportunity were granted to him, he should like to present the English reader with the only volume of sermons that was ever published by this eminent minister, of whom Limborch says, he was *eloquentissimus juxta ac doctissimus concionator.* Indeed he was at the Hague, in 1606, what Saurin was in 1720—an attractive preacher to the great and learned who resided there. Among his auditors were Barneveldt, the first statesman of that day, and Grotius, one of the greatest geniuses of the age. The latter declared that he retained a distinct recollection of the effect of his sermons, preached in the church at the Hague, twenty-five years after they were delivered to crowded and attentive assemblies.

In so doing it will be necessary to advert to the change which took place in his opinions, as stated at the twenty-second page. We have no means of knowing the character of his feelings, at the time he found himself impelled to embrace certain doctrines he had engaged to refute. But to say that he would not be the subject of strong excitement and mental conflict, would be to assert that he was not a man, or, at least, was destitute of those sensibilities which distinguish our common nature.

While it is universally allowed, that this gentleman was singularly amiable in his temper, and gentle in his manners,* it may be affirmed with equal truth, that he possessed a large share of manly independence and unbending courage. This we think will be granted, when we see him, not only overcoming those feelings which would rise to oppose the declaration of his incompetency to answer the arguments made use of in the work he was appointed to refute, but publicly declaring he was won over to the opinions it advanced. To effect this must have cost him a painful struggle; but its admitted severity only makes the victory appear more honourable to his character, and brings before us his master mind, with higher claims to our homage, which could hold in abeyance to the force of conviction every feeling that might oppose the reception and avowal of what he deemed to be the evidence of truth. In doing this, he knew that he should relinquish an opportunity of securing fame, forfeit the esteem of his brethren, incur the displeasure of those who had selected him for the work, and be considered an apostate from the ranks of orthodoxy. Yet in spite of all this, that avowal was made, either directly or indirectly.

---

* Cross, the continuator of Grimesthorpe, who carries the history of the Netherlands up to 1627, was a bitter enemy of Arminius. His testimony, however, in favour of his moral character, we think it right to transcribe, with all the quaintness of style and orthography peculiar to that period, as it confirms the truth of the above statement:—"His morall conuersation was curteous, friendly, and affable, he being willing to conuerse both with rich and poore; which affabilitie caused him to be generally beloued of all men. If the companie discoursed of serious matters, he would then speake seriously: if they related matters of mirth, he would be as frolicke, in his discourse, as any of the rest: if any of his societie would exercise themselues with musicke, he was willing to doe the like. He entertained his friends and acquaintance liberally, and was willing to entertaine companie, but he did it temperately and in measure."—Folio edit. p. 1360.

What were the immediate effects of this disclosure on the minds of his friends, and especially on those who had requested him to defend the doctrines and fame of Beza, we cannot positively say. It is, however, more than probable, that the acknowledged prudence and piety of Arminius, joined with his native sweetness of temper and amiable deportment, prevented any thing like virulence manifesting itself against him, when he intimated his incapacity to accomplish the task assigned him. Had he been a bold, rash innovator, as some would insinuate, and announced his change of sentiment in the way of challenge to those of opposite views, there is little doubt but he had instantly excited the displeasure and opposition of those whose opinions on predestination he had deserted. But instead of this, he contented himself with merely avoiding the introduction into the pulpit of those points of doctrine in which he differed from several of his brother ministers. This circumstance, however, while it would leave his sermons untinctured by Calvin's "distressing views of the Divine decrees,"* gave to them more of the sweetness of the message the angel announced to the shepherds, which was "*good tidings of great joy to all people;*" "*Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good will toward men.*" Arminius' auditors increased; and crowded congregations listened with delight to his discourses. Here, perhaps, may be found the origin of the jealousy and displeasure of some of his clerical brethren, which they subsequently manifested against him in suspicions and complaints. This is not to be wondered at, and must be placed to the account of the weakness of human nature. It is not often that rival candidates for public fame cultivate close and lasting friendship. Many minor spirits whispered forth suspicions of Arminius' heterodoxy; but it was left to Gomarus, a man of strong mind, and daring character, to declare it openly. Much is said of this person, as to his want of amiableness of temper, and courteousness of conduct.* He was, at first, strongly opposed to the appointment of Arminius to the vacant chair of divinity at Leyden. Yet, after an interview with him, when the latter stated his views on certain points of doctrine, he declared that he was satisfied; and as there was a conformity of sentiment between them, save on the point of predestination, he would bear with his difference of opinion on that subject. He therefore gave him the right hand of fellowship, and Arminius was accordingly inducted into the office, and thus became the colleague of Gomarus.

---

* Mosheim.

---

* Clark, who was a great admirer of Gomarus' opinions, nevertheless states, in his Marrow of Ecclesiastical History, that he was too much given to indulge his passions, and charges him with ingratitude. The truth of this statement will appear from the account he gives of his conduct, not only to those who opposed his opinions, but also to his friends, who patronized him and his doctrines, and laboured to serve him. This was especially the case with Wallæus, who, when he found Gomarus determined to leave Leyden, hastened to entreat him to visit him at Middleburgh. Gomarus accepted his invitation. A short time after, Wallæus was offered, by the magistrates of this place, the professorship of Divinity Commonplaces of a public seminary they patronized in that city. Gomarus' bile was excited at the circumstance of thus being passed by, and, though a kind of guest with Wallæus, charged him with heresy. This person, who was an able disputant and good scholar, seems to have been an amiable and pious man, and at one time was the friend of Grotius, in common with Arminius and Episcopius, and long strove to stem the torrent and violence of the bigoted Calvinists, but finding this to be impossible he at length fell in with the stream, and became the defender of the Synod of Dort, its canons and decrees. On Episcopius being deprived of his professorship by the Calvinistic party, he was chosen to succeed him. In virtue of his office he was entitled, and frequently urged by the enemies of Arminius, to take possession of the house in which his widow continued to reside, through the influence of the friends of her deceased husband. He had, however, so much reverence for his memory that he refused to take possession of it, until this lady herself came and offered it to him. We shall have to notice some praiseworthy features in this clergyman's conduct toward Grotius, his former friend, when he was unjustly sentenced to perpetual imprisonment by the Calvinistic faction.

We shall now proceed to give the epitome of the sentiments of these two divines, as presented to us by Limborch, in his memoirs of Episcopius. We do this the more readily, that the reader may be able to judge of the opinions of these two famous men, and determine for himself which are most in accordance with the declarations of the Holy Scriptures.

The sentiments of Gomarus were as follows:—

That God, alike to make known his tender mercy and inflexible justice, did of his own mere good pleasure divide, from all eternity, mankind into parts; the one, and that by far the less, he predestinated to eternal salvation; and the other, necessarily the greater, he reprobated to everlasting damnation. And for the accomplishment of his decree, founded thereon, he resolved to create man, and prescribe to him the observance of a law, but so arranging the circumstances of his condition, that he must unavoidably, with all his posterity, be involved in a state of sin, and thereby with them justly* become liable to eternal damnation. Nevertheless, in accordance with his purpose of grace toward the elect, God decreed to send Jesus Christ his Son into the world, who should make a full and perfect satisfaction to Divine justice, for all their sins, that they might thereby be brought into a state of reconciliation with him. And in order that these persons, thus redeemed by his Son Jesus Christ, might be effectually made the subjects of faith and repentance, he would by a powerful and effectual calling, which it would be impossible for them to resist, so operate on their minds as necessarily to produce in them genuine faith and conversion; which mighty power, in its continued and irresistible operations, would preserve them to the end, so that they could not again fall into a state of sin, which is inconsistent with genuine faith, and the enjoyment of salvation: or, in the event of their falling, yet they should not be left to continue therein to the end of life; but, through the powerful influence of Divine grace, should be recalled to repentance before death, and consequently be brought to partake of eternal salvation. On the other hand, he denied that God had sent his Son into the world for the reprobate, or indeed that he ever intended to afford them any assistance, by which they should become the subjects of repentance and conversion. From hence it followed, that being left in their depravity, and without the means of salvation, and that to the end of life, they must inevitably die in their sins, and suffer eternal damnation. Such were the sentiments of Professor Gomarus, who, it will be seen, contemplated the predestination of God as being antecedent to the fall of man, and whose opinions, when duly considered, will be found to be more harsh and repugnant than the sentiments of those who, on the contrary, viewed this predestination as taking place subsequent to the fall,—a doctrine which was afterward admitted and adopted by the Synod of Dort.

---

* How this could be according to the above scheme, we leave the reader to judge.

The sentiments of Arminius are thus expressed :—

That God, foreseeing the apostasy of the human race, out of his abundant mercy and loving kindness decreed the appointment of a universal remedy, that should be adequate to the restoration of all men, by the removal of that liability to destruction to which they had become awfully subject through sin. This restoration was to be effected by the mediation of Jesus Christ his Son, whom he appointed to be delivered up to death, as a propitiation for the sins of all mankind; and upon this propitiation, as a basis of reconciliation, he resolved to enter into a covenant with the whole of the human family, by which he decreed that all those who should believe in his Son, and embrace the conditions of this covenant, should receive the forgiveness of all their sins. And for the purpose of enabling them to submit to its terms, and participate its blessings, he determined and commanded that it should not only be announced, by his messengers and servants, to all men in general, but also that its promulgation should be accompanied by, and ratified with that efficacious grace by which all those to whom it should be published might be able to embrace and receive it. Nevertheless this grace was not to act upon them with such a mighty and irresistible power as to preclude the possibility of its being opposed; but, on the contrary, should leave them free agents to resist its influence, which, under the dictate of depravity, is not only done, but in too many fearful instances is awfully and obstinately persisted in. So that although the existence of faith and obedience in man must be traced up to the grace of God, powerfully operating on his mind, yet his unbelief and continued disobedience are from himself, an awful evidence of which is seen in his slighting and neglecting this grace. And while its operation is thus necessary to the production of faith and obedience, so its influence is amply sufficient to enable those who are its subjects so to profit by it, as to abide in a state of salvation, even to the end. But whether they could finally fall from a state of faith, was a point on which he felt himself unable fully and positively to decide, to the satisfaction of his own mind. He asserted, therefore, that the decree of Divine predestination especially related to, and consisted in, the purpose of God determining that all those to whom the blessing of this grace was offered, should in consequence of believingly receiving it, and continuing therein to the end, be saved; while, on the contrary, those who rejected it, and continued in unbelief, should be damned.

Such were the sentiments of Arminius, of which Gomarus, at a subsequent period, when the former gave a more extended statement of them before the States-General, declared in that assembly that with such opinions he should be afraid to appear in the presence of God. This declaration was made with a violence of temper so completely opposed to the gentle manner in which Arminius had stated them, that many of the members of that distinguished body asserted that "they would rather die with the charity of Arminius than the faith of Gomarus."

After Arminius had entered on the duties of his office, as divinity professor, he avoided, as far as he could consistently with peace of conscience, the introduction of his sentiments among the students, in order that he might not give offence to Gomarus. By this mode of acting, in connection with his prudence* and mild deportment, he succeeded for a time in securing the favour and friendship of his colleague. But the difference of opinion which he entertained from his colleague on the subject of predestination, stood connected with so many other doctrinal points, that in exhibiting the latter to his pupils there was an obvious dissimilarity between his mode, and that of Gomarus in presenting them. Besides, here, as at Amsterdam, Arminius became exceedingly popular and his fame attracted the attention of many learned persons, who attended his lectures. Gomarus felt this to be a source of mortification, and he found it difficult to suppress his displeasure, even while he professed to treat him with the customary signs of friendship. These courtesies, however, soon ceased under the excitement of passion, and a rupture ensued between them, which divided the members and students of the college into two parties; the one adopting the views of Gomarus, and the other those of Arminius. Among the persons who attached themselves to the opinions of the latter, was the subject of these memoirs. This circumstance induced the ministers who had received the creed of the former, to evince their disapprobation of his conduct, by withholding those tokens of esteem they had previously manifested toward him.

---

* Cross, when speaking of the prudent and mild conduct of Arminius after he entered on his office, says, "He carried himselfe in this manner for the better effecting of his secret ends, the foxe at length vnkennels himselfe by shewing a book to his neerest friends, which he had verie cunningly written against *John Caluin, Zan.*

The people and magistrates of Gouda, whom the reader will recollect as having protected Herman Herberts from the persecuting bigotry of some Calvinistic divines, being made acquainted with the talents of Episcopius and the fact of his having embraced those sentiments they had been accustomed to hear from the lips of that devout and holy minister long before they were adopted by Arminius, were very desirous that he should be ordained and appointed their pastor. This they made known to him in the year 1608. But being informed that he was extremely anxious to visit some of the foreign universities, they deemed it proper to waive any farther expression of their wishes, in order that he might be allowed the oppor-

---

chius, *Peter Martir*, and *Beza*, and when he durst vnbosom himselfe he commended the bookes of *Castalio* and *Derrick Cornehart*, and divers others of the same mould." His thus writing cunningly against John Calvin, and recommending the works of Castalio, &c., were considered by this person as very great crimes; how far they will be deemed such by the reader is not for me to say.

tunity of accomplishing an object for the attainment of which he appeared to be so deeply solicitous. But though he was so far successful in preparing the way for his departure as to secure the consent and support of his patrons, the honourable senate and magistrates of Amsterdam, nevertheless measures were adopted by certain persons, who now opposed him in consequence of his attachment to Arminius, that he was under the necessity of relinquishing his design and continuing to reside for the present at Leyden. This period, however, was not unoccupied by him; on the contrary it was marked by more than his wonted application and devotedness to the study of theology. He was constant in his attendance on the college exercises or disputations. His singular erudition, accompanied with so much modesty of behaviour, purity of conduct, and sedateness of character, being reported to the burgomasters of Amsterdam, they requested that he might be immediately set apart to the ministry. But the clergy of the city, who were, for the most part, vehemently opposed to the doctrines taught by Arminius, knew how to interpose, first one delay and then another, till they finally succeeded at that time in frustrating the benevolent designs of the burgomasters toward him. At length, being deeply chagrined and worn out by the treatment he met with, he resolved to quit the university of Leyden and hasten to that of Franeker. He was principally determined in his purpose of visiting this seat of learning, from the circumstance of John Drusius being the professor of Hebrew in this university, whose fame as an oriental scholar had spread far and wide.

CHAPTER III.

Our young student left the university of Leyden in June, 1609, and arrived at Franeker on the twelfth of the same month. Long before he had reached this city, his intention of visiting its university had been rumoured among the inhabitants. And from the circumstance of its being known that he had fully imbibed the doctrines of Arminius, and greatly surpassed any other of the pupils of that professor, both in talent and literary attainments, his arrival was looked for with the most intense interest.

He entered Franeker on the Sabbath morning, about seven o'clock; and at the usual hour repaired to church in order to attend Divine service. On his way thither he was noticed by several citizens as being a stranger, and they began to conjecture that he was the much talked of, and long expected Episcopius. First one person crossed his path, and then another, for the purpose of taking a glance at him. The number increased, and their curiosity became more strongly excited. At length one of the persons who followed him, unable to repress his curiosity any longer, stepping up to him, politely intimated that he judged him to be a stranger in the city, and begged to know if he was Mr. Episcopius. To this interrogation he frankly replied, *I am*. Scarcely was this answer returned to the inquirer than he conveyed the information to another, and this to a third, till from those present it spread to others; so that the news of his arrival flew through the city with telegraphic rapidity, and in a few hours after he had entered the town, it was known by the professors, students, and the greater part of the citizens. He was subsequently informed by several of the inhabitants, that his coming was as much anticipated and more anxiously inquired after than was sometimes Count William's.* Thus it is that while the possession of splendid talents and extensive learning renders their subject pre-eminent among his fellows, so the knowledge of it cannot be confined to his own immediate circle, but passes from city to city, and not unfrequently from kingdom to kingdom.

Scarcely had Episcopius looked out for himself a suitable residence,† when there was handed to him the thesis or proposition of Dr. Sibrandus, on the subject of the seventh chapter of Romans. This was to be publicly discussed on the 17th of July. When Episcopius left Leyden for the university of Franeker, he was particularly solicited by Arminius not to engage in any of the college disputations. This counsel was given to him by his meek master, that he might avoid the very appearance of adopting any measures that would tend to produce excitement, and give offence by the introduction of the sentiments he had espoused. When he first entered the city he had fully made up his mind to abide by these suggestions of Arminius. But several events transpired which induced him to think it right to alter his purpose. Among others which contributed to this was the circumstance of his hearing that a report was spread in Holland by certain bigoted persons, that measures of a penal kind were about to be adopted against him by the university, though for what cause it was not stated. He therefore felt himself the more inclined to take part in the anticipated discussion, for the purpose of quashing this rumour. He was farther prompted to this by the frequent and earnest entreaties of many of the students, and especially those of the one who was appointed to defend it under the superintendence of Sibrandus. Thus circumstanced, he turned his attention to the subject, and went somewhat prepared to offer his remarks upon it, if he judged at the time it would be proper for him so to do.

---

* This was Count William Louis, of Nassau, stadtholder of Friezland. He was in the practice of visiting all the towns, according to the custom of the counts after they entered on their government. On these occasions they guarantied the liberties of the citizens; which being done, the people paid the tax imposed upon them.—*Mod. Univ. Hist.*, vol. iii.

† The students board in the town at different lodging houses, wherever their inclination or resources may dispose them.—*Sir John Carr.*

The thesis being read, one of the students rose, made a few brief objections, and then sat down. A lengthened and profound silence followed. All eyes were now turned toward Episcopius; but he kept his seat, and showed no disposition to rise. After some time this pause was interrupted by a single voice, crying, "Episcopius!" This was followed by several others, till at length, from all sides, he was called upon to take part in the debate. He rose, but it was for the purpose of begging to be excused, —apologizing, at the same time, for refusing to attend to the call of the assembly,—and then resumed his seat. His excuses and entreaties to be allowed to be silent were not regarded; and being thus urged, he proceeded to comply with the wishes of the auditory. In doing this he pointed out what he considered to be the defective parts of the thesis. His remarks, the delivery of which occupied some length of time, were as much distinguished by the acuteness and energy of thought they displayed as the interesting manner in which they were stated; while the varied and powerful arguments with which he attacked Dr. Sibrandus won for him in the university the esteem of many, and the reputation of a man of extraordinary acquirements and powers of mind. Even Sibrandus himself subsequently declared to some of his friends, "that he had disputed with a young Leydener who might indeed be justly designated an Arminian, inasmuch as he was fully persuaded that Arminius himself could not more accurately or more forcibly have presented his arguments and proofs than he had done."

Throughout the whole of this disputation, Sibrandus behaved toward him in the most polite and friendly manner, and publicly praised him, as much for the matter and solidity of his arguments, as for the correct and orderly manner in which they had been arranged and presented. He afterward repeatedly and earnestly entreated him to visit him for the purpose of friendly intercourse; and expressed his anxious solicitude to be more intimately acquainted with him, adding, also, that he felt much obliged by the part he had taken in the debate, and that it would afford him great pleasure if his pupils and auditors were frequently thus engaged and interested. But while Sibrandus declared his high estimate of the talents and capabilities of Episcopius as a disputant, the opinion was not reciprocated on the part of the latter. This will appear from an extract of a letter written to Arminius about this time in which he gives a particular and interesting account of this disputation; intimating, also, that as an antagonist, Sibrandus was not to be dreaded; and expressly states, "that he found him altogether unlike Gomarus, who, by various manœuvres and subtle distinctions, constantly endeavoured to evade the force of an argument, whereas Sibrandus on the contrary stood before an opponent with a species of stupid simplicity which exposed him to every dart that was aimed at him."*

---

* In this letter, which will be found in the Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ et Theologicæ, p. 228, he states that the line of argument he took, in maintaining the sentiments he advanced, was founded

In consequence of the part Episcopius had taken in this debate, the attention of the students and members of the university was directed toward him. Many of the former waited upon him, for the purpose of testifying their respect and esteem for a young man who had exhibited such vigour of mind and extent of learning. Others came and requested to be instructed by him, at his own convenience, on various points of theology. He, however, modestly but firmly refused to comply with their solicitations. While the students were thus complimenting, and entreating him to take part in the future discussions of the college, the Professor Antonides, who is named at page 21, apprehensive of the probable results of his so doing, sent his compliments to him, by the beadle of the college, four days after he had debated with Sibrandus, stating that he wished to have an interview with him. On the part of this gentleman, the professed object of this meeting was that of congratulating Episcopius on his arrival at Franeker; the real one, that of endeavouring to persuade him not to take part in the public discussions of the university. When Episcopius came into his presence he received him very courteously; informing him, that by letters from various quarters he had been made acquainted with his name, and his intention of visiting the university. Through the same means, he said he had also been informed of his having fully received the sentiments of Arminius, and expressed a wish to be favoured by him with a brief sketch of the doctrines taught by that professor. But when Episcopius evinced his readiness to comply with his request, and proposed that they should have another interview for that purpose, he waived the subject, as not being the main object he had in view, and then proceeded to express his wish, that he would avoid the adoption of any measures that might tend to produce excitement, either among the students, or senior members of the university.

As the usual period was approaching for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Episcopius presented the testimo-

---

on the two following positions:—1st. Hic agere apostolum in persona hominis irregeniti; non tamen intellige, qualiter irregenitum describunt.—2d. De fundamento sententiæ eorum qui contra sentiunt, constitutione nimirum hominis irregeniti.

nials he had received from the consistory of Leyden, by the hand of Adrian Borrius, to the minister Rudolphus Artopeus. This clergyman received him with marked tokens of approbation; and he was accordingly admitted as a member of the Church of Franeker, and received the sacrament with the other communicants.

His studies were now interrupted, in consequence of his receiving information of the alarming illness of his beloved master Arminius. On the receipt of the letter, which at once brought him this painful intelligence and summoned him to Holland, he immediately left Franeker for Leyden, apprehending from the tenor of its contents that he was about to pay a last visit, which was really the case, to his esteemed friend and amiable teacher. The disease of this gentleman, says Limborch, was undoubtedly occasioned by the multiplicity of his engagements; but it was greatly aggravated by the various attacks, to which he was exposed from all quarters, of violent and bigoted persons; but especially by the malevolent treatment he met with from some divines of the city of Amsterdam.*

---

* How true this is his own complaints will show. When writing to his friend, Dr. Sebastian Egbert, one of the principal magistrates of Amsterdam, he says, in relation to this subject, "I have to grapple with the worst of all the furies, the first-born vice of the devil, from which he also derives his title: [DIABOLUS, *the accuser of the brethren!*] I have resolved to subdue it by patience. God grant that I may be sustained by the strength of his Spirit, and thus enabled to obtain a conquest! There is nothing according to their own confession, which certain zealots leave unattempted here and elsewhere, both in our native country and abroad, in Germany and France, that they may cast me down from my seat, [professor's *chair*,] and may silence me who am an obscure individual. But their strenuous endeavours have hitherto been in vain: and the result has not been felicitous to themselves; because by their calumnies they ennoble one whose chief desire it was to remain in a state of privacy, and who could not possibly have obtained celebrity for himself by his personal qualities! The main origin of this evil is in your city, where such circumstances are confidently related about me as durst not even be whispered by any man in this city, where I am daily teaching in public and private, if that individual entertained a fear that his whispers would afterward be disclosed to me. The conduct of men toward me, especially among your citizens, is of such a nature as to make them think that they may invent falsehoods, detractions, and slanders against me, and all the while be committing no offence. A heretic let me be [accounted;] yet I am a man, whom God has formed after his own image, and for whom Christ has shed his blood. Let my enemies

Shortly after Episcopius had arrived at Leyden, the disease of his master assumed alarming features; and as there was reason to suppose it would speedily terminate fatally, he was constant in his attendance upon him, sitting by his bedside day and night. Although Arminius was subject to severe pain, which prevented him taking much sleep, he was nevertheless favoured with perfect vigour and tranquillity of mind. Episcopius had, therefore, frequent conversations with him, on subjects which might be supposed to lie nearest the heart of this holy and devoted man, that is, on the person of Jesus Christ, the merit of his death, and the power of his resurrection. Favoured with the enjoyment of religious peace himself, he evinced great anxiety for its existence in the Church. Hence he was continually repeating, with the emphasis of solemn prayer, that passage in the writings of St. Paul: *Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.*

The friends of Arminius intimating that his disease might be of long continuance, Episcopius took his leave of him, and returned to Franeker, about the beginning of October. In this, however, they were mistaken, as it was not long before he received the melancholy intelligence of his death. This event took place on the nineteenth of the same month, when this holy man and distinguished minister was removed from earth, to enjoy the happiness of heaven. His closing hours were marked with holy peace and devout resignation, arising from a full assurance of his interest in the promises and mercy of God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, his Divine Redeemer. Such was the end of a man, whom bigotry and envy had long

---

be silent, and cease from their clamorous harangues before the people in public, and from their secret whispers and private slanders, and the matter is instantly adjusted. I am acquainted with two remedies against calumny, and I employ both of them—INNOCENCE and PATIENCE!" May the Lord be pleased to bestow the latter upon me, since he has hitherto granted me the enjoyment of the former." *Nichols.*

persecuted as an apostate and heretic, for having dared to assert God's love to the whole human family; and that Jesus Christ not only *tasted death for every man*, but that he really and truly was *the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.** He went down to the grave amid the rejoicings of his enemies, many of whom, though they had not sufficient decorum to suppress their exultation at his death, yet found it impossible to fix upon his memory any thing like a well founded charge, that could affect his character as a man and a Christian. Nevertheless, the measures they adopted to attempt so foul a purpose, when known to be those of men sustaining the office of the Christian ministry, must be deemed an occasion of deep regret, painfully proving, that when religious bigotry takes hold of the mind, and governs it to a certain extent, its subject is prepared to pursue its victim while living with hatred and calumny, and when dead, to brand his memory with infamy and disgrace. Those who are well acquainted with the history of Arminius, and the treatment his memory met with, will admit that though this language is strong, yet the testimony of facts fully justifies its adoption.*

---

* That the doctrine of the universal extent of the atonement of Christ was taught by some of the reformers long before the time of Arminius, will be seen by the two following extracts from Bullinger, whose writings, according to Le Vassor, contributed so much to the spread of the Reformation in Holland. They are taken from the French edition of his works, the preface of which is dated 1549. We shall retain the orthography of the text:—"Jesus Christ nous ait oste par sa mort, la coulpê de nos pechez, et qu'il ait este fait satisfaction pour tout le monde," p. 32. "Le Fils de Dieu, nostre seigneur Jesus, a abondanment satisfait, pour la coulpè le monde," p. 33. By the moderate Calvinists of the present day the doctrine of Jesus Christ having *tasted death for every man* is very generally admitted; yet such admission in the days of Arminius and Episcopius, would have subjected them to the charge of Socinianism; not, perhaps, for asserting this doctrine itself, but under the pretence of their holding others which they were unwilling to acknowledge; for in this disingenuous manner did the Dutch divines of the Geneva school constantly attempt to render the advocates of universal redemption suspected of Socinianism. Should it be said that they had good reasons for this, on the ground of the system of Arminius tending to it, as was evident from several of those who afterward bore his name becoming Socinians; yet it should be recollected that, by the same mode of arguing, it might be shown that the opinions of Calvin also tended to Socinianism, seeing that the Churches of Geneva, which had formerly received his doctrines, had, till of late, universally embraced the errors of Socinus. In cases of this kind we ought rather to adopt the sentiments of a modern writer on ecclesiastical history, who says, "He is not to be made answerable for all the sentiments adopted by those who, in after ages, become his professed followers."—*Sabine's History of the Christian Church*, p. 224.

These gentlemen supposed that the death of Arminius would be the extinction of his system, but in this they were mistaken. His creed lived, and found an incomparable defender in the subject of these memoirs, who now began to assume a more conspicuous appearance before the public,† and by his proceedings showed himself every way worthy of the master by whom he had been instructed, of whose sentiments he was soon to be recognized as the able advocate, and talented defender. With the exception of his bereaved widow, and nine orphan children, none felt and mourned the loss of Arminius more sincerely than Episcopius. He was his most intimate and beloved friend, and he felt his death as depriving him of the still farther anticipated instructions of one, who, he was fully persuaded, had not left his fellow behind, as a man of mental power, and a professor of theology. These views he stated in a letter to some of his friends, deploring, at the same time, the circumstance of his having left the university of Leyden for Franeker, by which he lost so much of the instructions of Arminius, only receiving, as an equivalent for them, the advantage of hearing the lectures of Drusius, the professor of Hebrew; the others being men, in point of ability, comparatively inferior to those of Leyden.

---

* The reader, who may wish to have a correct view of the character of this amiable man, may consult Mr. Nichols' Life of him, which comprehends the whole of Bertius' funeral oration, with the principal portion of C. Brandt's life, published in Latin, 1724. We shall, however, present an extract from this oration, to prove the justice of the above remarks, from a translation of it published nearly two hundred years ago by J. K. This writer very justly remarks that, had Bertius delivered untruths, he would soon have been detected by the assembly in which he delivered them. Speaking of a dimness in one of the eyes with which Arminius was affected, and a swelling in the arm, he adds,—"In the meanwhile calumny was as cruel, and abated nothing of its accustomed fierceness, of which I shall here mention a cruel, unworthy, and abominable instance, which is fit to be recorded for after ages. When that dimness of one of his eyes was known, there were some that durst account this among those punishments which God threatens to his enemies and wicked contemners of his name, and did affirm even from this punishment that he was very wicked beyond others. And that there might not be wanting a pretext and colour to this so filthy and cruel a deed, the sacred books are consulted with, which a Christian may not approach without reverence and prayer. A place is found in the Prophet Zechariah concerning the consumption of the eyes and the whole body, sounding thus:—*And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem: their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet; and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth*, Zech. xiv, 12. And another place, *Wo to the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock: the sword shall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye: his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened*, ch. xi, 7. Thus things above, things below, things on the right hand, things on the left, things Divine, things human, wait on those wretched hierophants [expounders of Divine mysteries] to serve them when they will"

† Benthem's Schulen-Staat.

On his return to Franeker, Episcopius again disputed with Sibrandus, on the subject of justification. This was on the 21st of October, and now, as on the former occasion, he was applauded by several persons; but, as might be expected, he was looked upon by others with envy and jealousy. The parties under the influence of these feelings manifested them by endeavouring to fix upon him the charge of heterodoxy. The method adopted to effect this, was such as was usually resorted to in that day, by the patrons of unconditional reprobation and election, when they wished to blast the reputation of an individual, namely, that of asserting that he was a Socinian: and he who dared but to whisper that *God so loved the world* as to send his Son to become a propitiatory sacrifice for every man, was sure thus to be branded. This was a species of polemical trickery which they who had recourse to, knew how it would tell against a man, and availed themselves of it in order to render an opponent odious to the people. That the followers of Calvin frequently resorted to such dishonourable means, in order to ruin the person who differed from them in doctrinal points, these memoirs will clearly show. We shall mention one instance here, given by Limborch, as it will show to what shifts the enemies of Episcopius resorted, in order to injure him. At Franeker, the master of a vessel resided, who was accustomed to trade to Dantzic. During his visits to this place, he had formed an acquaintance with some of the followers of Socinus, and by them had been induced to adopt their sentiments. He was an illiterate man, his vernacular language being the only one he knew; nevertheless, he was mightily pleased with his supposed knowledge of certain disputed points of theology, and evinced great anxiety, and seized every occasion that offered itself, of entering the lists as a combatant with the students, for the purpose of debating with them on subjects in which he dissented from the received opinions of the Church. The wide spreading fame of Episcopius roused his attention, and he became deeply solicitous to be introduced to him. He was rendered the more so from the fact of his residing in the street in which Episcopius lodged. By some means, the opportunity he so much wished for at length presented itself, which he eagerly embraced, and accordingly was introduced to him. He subsequently paid him two or three more visits, when they entered into conversation on certain doctrines of Christianity. This was soon rumoured abroad, and it was positively asserted by the enemies of Episcopius, that he had fully imbibed the sentiments of this man, and moreover, that he had actually procured by his assistance, from Dantzic, several Socinian books for his own use.

As this report was assiduously and extensively spread, Episcopius deemed it due to himself to contradict it. Among other persons who seem to have heard of it, was his brother Rembert Bisschop. This gentleman was much older than Simon, and manifested a species of parental affection for him. Indeed, Episcopius looked to him with filial, rather than fraternal regard, and at his death mourned his loss as a son would mourn the loss of a father. It is not improbable that Rembert had written to his brother on the subject, as the latter sent him a letter, dated December 22d, 1609, in which he asserted, "that he had never commissioned this person to obtain more than one publication for him, which was on the subject of infant baptism, and even that he did not succeed in procuring. And supposing that he really had engaged him to obtain other books than the one named, wherein should he have been more blamable than Dr. Sibrandus, who was in the constant practice of employing this very man to procure for him the various Socinian works which he actually possessed." He farther adds, "that in his intercourse with this person, he had invariably refuted the sentiments he had adopted, and therefore had not given to any one, with the appearance of truth or justice, the slightest grounds of suspicion against him." Nevertheless, that he might cut off all occasions to his enemies of reproaching him on the subject, he avoided all intercourse with this person, and rarely spoke to him afterward.

Toward the close of the disputation Episcopius held with Dr. Sibrandus in October, he had asserted that he did not admit that "those persons held strange and erroneous opinions on the subject of justification, who maintained that the word *faith* was to be understood, not metonymically for its object, but in a proper and literal sense."* And in support of this statement, he assigned the following reason,—"that some were justified, the object of whose faith could not be the righteousness of Christ; therefore their faith could not be understood metonymically for this righteousness. By such faith," he said, "the apostles were justified before the death of Christ, they not knowing that he was to die, much less that his death was to be the ground of their justification." These statements he supported by many appropriate quotations from the New Testament. The debate being closed, Sibrandus publicly announced, that he should

---

* John Goodwin says, "That when faith is said to be imputed to us for righteousness, the word is taken literally and not tropically, which was the common interpretation anciently received and followed by the principal lights of the Church of God, and for 1500 years was never questioned or contradicted. Neither did the contrary opinion look out into the world until the last age. So that it is but a calumny brought upon it, (unworthy the tongue or pen of any sober man,) to make either Arminius or Socinus the author of it. And for this last hundred years and upward, from Luther's and Calvin's times, the stream of interpreters agree therewith." In support of the antiquity of this view of justification, he then gives a list of divines, beginning with Tertullian and proceeding to Origen, Justin Martyr, Chrysostom, St. Augustine, Primasius, Bede, Hayne, Anselm, Luther, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Hunnius, Beza, Junius, and others, giving extracts at the same time from the writings of each in proof of his assertion. Nevertheless, he who maintained this doctrine was, by the Calvinists of that day both in Holland and England, treated as a Socinian. Hence, Baxter says, "Mr. Anthony Wotton, a very learned and godly divine of London, was charged with Socinianism, heresy, and blasphemy, for maintaining in his treatise *De Reconciliatione*, that he is righteous to whom all sin of omission and commission is forgiven, and for having laboured to disprove the rigid imputation of Christ's holiness and obedience to man." In doing this, continues Baxter, "this very eminent man confuted these three assertions:—1. That a sinner is reputed to have fulfilled the law in and by Christ: 2. And being reputed to have fulfilled the law, is taken for formally just as a fulfiller of it: 3. And being formally just as a fulfiller of the law, eternal life is due to him by that covenant that saith, *Do this and*

live."—Goodwin on Justification.—Brook's Lives of the Puritans, as quoted by Jackson in his Life of Goodwin.

If the attempt to prove these three propositions false, not merely rendered this man suspected of heresy, but was actually the occasion of his being examined on a charge of "Socinianism and blasphemy," at two separate meetings by several London ministers, one can but ask, in what grade in the ranks of blasphemers such a man as Dwight and many of our modern Calvinists would have been placed, had they lived in that day and dared to have published the following sentiment: "The supposition incautiously admitted by some divines, that Christ satisfied the demands of the law by his active and passive obedience, is unfounded in the Scriptures. We owe God our obedience; and obedience in its own nature is due from the subject himself, and can never be rendered by another. In refusing to render it we are criminal. No substitute can, by any possible effort, make us cease to be guilty, or to deserve punishment. This is beyond the ability of Omnipotence itself."* Now, though the late Mr. Orme, in his Life of John Owen, says, "It is true, that the body of modern Calvinists may not adopt every expression and sentiment of those of Owen's day, yet this is not because they are become more Arminianized than their fathers, but because they express themselves in fewer words, and are not so much attached to the peculiar phraseology of scholastic disputation;" nevertheless it is apprehended that this statement would hardly be deemed a sufficient apology for the above passage, if it had been made to a class of men such as the Rev. G. Walker, who brought the charge of blasphemy against Watton, and could call John Goodwin, for vindicating him and his sentiments, a Socinian, liar, lying sophist, impudent fellow, heretic, blasphemer, a man of Satanic spirit, &c. We really are afraid, in spite of the above apology, that many of our good brethren of the modern school of Calvinism, if they had lived in that day, would have been anathematized as Arminians by the sounder divines of the commonwealth, and handed over to the devil, in common with ourselves, Dr. Bennet himself, of dissenting historic notoriety not being excepted; an event he would undoubtedly have considered as greatly aggravated by the circumstance of his being forced to submit to such a destiny in such company.

---

* Dwight's Sermons, vol. ii, p. 570.

introduce a proposition, for the purpose of demonstrating the falsity of the statement advanced by Episcopius.

As this opinion was made the ground of a charge of Socinianism against him, at a subsequent period, we shall interrupt the narrative, to introduce the statements of two or three writers on the subject, to confirm its truth.

John Owen, who will not be suspected of any leaning toward Arminianism, remarks, when speaking on the case of Abraham, (Gen. xv, 6,) which seems to be in point, "It may be observed, that the first testimony given to the justification of Abraham by faith, was on his belief of that part of the promise, that *his seed should be as the stars of heaven that cannot be numbered*; for thereon it is immediately added, *he believed in the Lord, who accounted it to him for righteousness*; for although the promise concerned things temporal, yet it belonged to the way of redemption by Christ the promised seed,—so as that justifying faith may act itself, and be an evidence of our justification when we believe promises even about temporal mercies, as they belong to the covenant; whereof we have innumerable examples under the Old Testament."*

The late Robert Hall says, "What were the precise views entertained by the true Israel, of the offices of the Messiah, and the work of redemption, previously to the Christian era, is one of the most curious and intricate questions of theology. Without attempting its solution, the writer may be permitted to remark, that the Jewish belief was probably much more defective, and differed much farther from the Christian, than has usually been suspected. The ignorance of the apostles, till after the resurrection, is a fundamental fact, a datum never to be lost sight of. The average degree of knowledge which divines have been accustomed to ascribe to Jewish believers, has been overrated. From the typical institution of piacular sacrifices, pointing to the *great propitiation*, it has been confidently concluded, that in them believers distinctly recognized the mystery of atonement by the blood of Christ. But supposing such to have been the fact, how shall we account for that doctrine occupying so small a portion of the succeeding prophecies; or for its completely vanishing from the national creed,—that the crucifixion of Christ afterward became a stumbling block to the Jews, not less than foolishness to the Gentiles? If we read the ancient prophecies with attention, we shall perceive that the atonement made by the Saviour is scarcely exhibited in a single passage, except in the fiftieth of Isaiah, with respect to which the Ethiopian eunuch was at a loss to determine whether the *prophet spoke of himself or some other man.* In the practical and devotional books, such as the Psalms, the promise of pardon to the penitent is repeatedly propounded, though with respect to the *medium* of acceptance, a profound silence is maintained.

---

* Owen on Hebrews, vol. vii, p. 95.

"The word *faith*, to the illiterate reader, is almost sure to suggest all the sentiments and ideas with which the Gospel has made him familiar; and when we attempt to limit its objects by an impartial appeal to the actual state of religious knowledge before the coming of Christ, he feels confounded and amazed. But whoever examines with attention the various examples adduced by St. Paul, of the operation of this principle, must be convinced that the idea of a vicarious propitiation is not absolutely essential to its nature, however necessary to salvation it has become in consequence of the clear revelation of that doctrine."

Mr. Watson's remarks connected with his arguments in favour of the salvation of persons dying in infancy, may here be adduced, as indirectly bearing on this subject. "The very wisdom of God may assure us, that in the means appointed by which the *free gift* shall pass to its issue, justification of life, the circumstances of the persons must be taken into the account."—"When we see, even in adults, that independently of their own acts, the meritorious cause is not inert, but fruitful in vital influence and gracious dealing, we see such a separation of the operation of the grand meritorious cause and the subordinate instrumental causes, as to prove that the benefits of the death of Christ are not, in every case, confined under certain restraints;" and we would add, as applicable to Episcopius' statement, not under the same conditions to believers of the Old, as those of the New Testament. (Vol. ii, p. 231.)

The subject will appear in a still more interesting point of light, by the following remarks of Mr. Hall. "It is expedient," he says, "to distinguish betwixt the *fact* and the *doctrine* of the atonement. The aspect of the atonement of Christ, considered as a *transaction*, is toward God; considered as a *doctrine*, toward man. Viewed in the former light, its operation is essential, unchangeable, eternal,—*He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.* Considered in the latter, its operation is moral, and therefore subject to all the varieties incident to human nature. The cross, considered as the meritorious basis of acceptance, the only real satisfaction for sin, is the centre around which all the purposes of mercy to fallen man have continued to revolve: fixed and determined in the council of God, it operated as the grand consideration in the Divine mind on which salvation was awarded to penitent believers in the earliest ages, as it will continue to operate in the same manner to the latest boundaries of time. Hence it is manifest that this great transaction could admit of no substitute. But the discovery of it, which constitutes the *doctrine* of the atonement, though highly important, is not of equal necessity."*

We shall now resume Limborch's narrative, who says that the boastful declaration of Sibrandus was not fulfilled till four months had elapsed. At the end of this period he produced the long expected proposition, and, what was altogether unusual, he invited the whole of the ministers of the city to witness the disputation. There were likewise present the different professors, who rarely attended on such occasions, with several of the clergy of the neighbouring towns; the whole of the students of the university, and a large portion of the citizens, who crowded to the scene of conflict to mark the result. At this discussion was present D. Albertus Hutthenus, then a disciple of Sibrandus, afterward professor of Hebrew at Sedan, and finally a minister among the Remonstrants. This gentleman related the following humorous circumstance to Limborch, as taking place prior to the commencement of this debate. Among the crowded assembly who had come to hear the disputation, were several citizens who knew not a word of Latin; and among others he espied the person with whom he lodged, and knowing that this was his case, he immediately made his way to him, and in a tone of surprise said, "Well, what has brought you here?" To which the other answered, "Why to hear the dispute betwixt Dr. Sibrandus and Mr. Episcopius, to be sure, and see who beats." "But how can you tell that," said Hutthenus, "as you will not understand a word they say?" "O," replied the other, waggishly, "that is no matter; I can easily tell who is beaten, without knowing what is said." "How so?" said Hutthenus: "Why," said the fellow with much naivete, "*because he who is beaten is sure to get into a passion.*" That the theory of this man is right we believe will be admitted, if the facts did not, in this instance, prove it to be so. The victor, in any combat, is usually too full of satisfaction and self-complacency to feel the emotions of fury and vengeance; such feelings being only the attendants of disappointment and defeat. There is even an insolent kind of clemency that arises from an eminent and palpable superiority over a combatant, which is calculated to enrage a defeated opponent: and this seems to have been the case here, according to the following account, as given by Episcopius' biographer.

---

* Hall's Works, vol. ii, p. 213.

The auditors being assembled, waited with intense anxiety for the commencement of this long expected and much talked of disputation. At length Sibrandus entered the assembly, took his place, and silence instantly followed. He then rose, and publicly challenged Episcopius to dispute with him, who readily answered to the call, and they proceeded. The contest lasted for a great length of time, both parties entering into a great variety of subjects intimately connected with the doctrine of justification. But throughout the whole of the disputation, Sibrandus showed that he was speaking under the influence of mortified feelings; the result of the defeats he had experienced from his comparatively juvenile opponent. This was evident from his uncourteous behaviour toward Episcopius, which Hutthenus witnessed, and afterward related to Limborch. He frequently made use of the most disrespectful language toward him; now jeering, and then taunting, and not unfrequently reproving him for his boyish ignorance and stupidity; and then, in a tone of assumed contempt, asserted that his arguments were not stated correctly, and to the best advantage, intimating, at the same time, in a sneering manner, that if he would give him leave, he would present them in such a form as would make them appear more forcible and to greater advantage. In short, he was so far carried away by the vehemence of anger and rage, as frequently to use unseemly gesticulations; now bending his body in the most unnatural and awkward attitudes, then in a fit of passion unconsciously raising his foot on the seat, he would afterward stamp with it in the most violent manner. At the conclusion of the disputation, the persons present who were ignorant of Latin, though not knowing what was said, yet deciding who was the victor, according to the mode of judging laid down by Hutthenus' host, rushed out and immediately announced that Sibrandus had lost the day, having been completely beaten by Episcopius. And though the learned part of the auditors did not decide by the same rule, as to the merits of the disputants, yet many of them gave their opinions on the subject in a way that was by no means creditable to the reputation of the professor, asserting that he had not met, in a fair and satisfactory manner, the arguments advanced by his opponent.

At the close of the debate, the prayer usually repeated on such occasions being ended, Sibrandus, though he had treated Episcopius in this disrespectful manner, nevertheless invited him to a second discussion on the subject, and solicited the auditors to be present to witness it. But he, being fully aware that Sibrandus had no control over his violent and irritable temper, declined complying with this invitation; saying, "It will hereafter be more prudent and safe for you, sir, to dispute with a person not afflicted with stupidity and dulness, or, at least, with one who, by his credulity and suppleness of mind, may render himself more agreeable than I am likely to do."

Episcopius having thus refused to concur with his request, Sibrandus sent one of the students to wait upon him with his compliments, saying that he should esteem it a great favour if he would send a copy of the arguments he had made use of in the debate, and any others he might deem it right to employ in favour of the views he had adopted on the subject. To this request Episcopius courteously returned a positive refusal. He then sent to know if he would examine a copy of them, as taken down at the time he used them, to ascertain if they were correctly noted. Here also he deemed it proper not to comply with his wishes. Thus foiled in his attempts to obtain a copy of the arguments Episcopius had used in the late disputation, he immediately drew up and exhibited another proposition for discussion, which was to the following effect:—"That faith is not accepted by God in the stead of that righteousness which is required by the law."* This he sent to Hutthenus to defend, who de-

---

* This proposition, the meaning of which does not appear very obvious when read in this unconnected form, may be illustrated and answered by a quotation from Professor Stuart's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle the Romans, iv, 3. "To reckon Abraham's belief as righteousness, cannot mean that the simple act, on the part of Abraham, of giving credit to the Divine testimony was tantamount to complete obedience in all respects to the Divine law, and was accepted as such. In this case Abraham would have been accepted on the ground of his own *merit;* for his *belief* was as much his own act as any kind of obedience could have been. To have his belief *imputed* or *accounted for righteousness*, then, must mean that in consequence of his belief he was treated as righteous, he was accepted as righteous; i. e., he was gratuitously justified, treated as righteous, accepted as righteous."

Episcopius, to rebut the charge of his teaching that we are justified by the merit of faith, makes the following statement, which we translate from his Sermons in Dutch: "Faith which is saving is active, bringing forth the fruits of righteousness; and when by it its subject comes to God for favour, or the forgiveness of sins, and obtains it, he does not so obtain it by the merit of this faith, or because God is bound to reward it with eternal righteousness. Such an opinion would be vain; nevertheless, because God, out of pure kindness, will account such an act of faith for righteousness, he has therefore made it man's interest to believe, and commanded him so to do. But it may be said, that if faith be viewed as an *act* or a *work*, then it must be considered as a deed of merit;—how futile! For how can an act be considered as meriting acquittal for its subject, the very nature of which, when correct, implies a confession that he has merited a judgment unto death. And he who would come thus to claim acquittal by the merit of such an act, would only show that he was tenfold more the creature of condemnation." Fol. p. 256.

To this effect is the language of Arminius: "Christ did not merit that we be justified by the dignity and merit of faith, but faith is the instrumental cause or action by which we apprehend Christ, and his righteousness offered unto us by God, according to the order and promise of the Gospel, where it is said, that *whosoever believes shall be justified and saved.* The *form of justification* is the gracious estimation of God, whereby he imputes the righteousness of clined acquiescing with his request, alleging that he had not, in the late disputation, given him the satisfaction he could have wished, and begged leave also to state, that as Sibrandus and his friends undoubtedly believed that he

Christ unto us, and imputes faith for righteousness; that is, God doth forgive our sins unto us who believe, for the sake of Christ apprehended by faith, and esteems us as righteous in him, which estimation hath annexed unto it the adoption of sons, and a collation of right to the inheritance of eternal life."

To this we may append the words of Curcellæus. Speaking of the charge of his advocating the merit of works, he exclaims, "God forbid that I should assert any such thing; but this I say, they are necessary, because God will not make us partakers of the salvation purchased by Christ's blood by *any other rule* or condition than that of believing in the merit of Christ."

In farther directing the attention of the reader to this subject, we feel we are intruding upon his forbearance; but we deem it due to the Remonstrants to make the following statements, because they were considered heterodox on this point by many of their Calvinistic opponents, who, for the most part, adopted the doctrine of the imputation of a twofold righteousness, in order to our justification, as it was first propounded by Zuinglius. The one which he called the *active* righteousness of Christ, he said, was the effect of his having fulfilled the whole law for us, and therefore our obedience is perfect and complete in him. The other he designated the *passive* righteousness of Christ, the result of his obedience unto death. By the latter, he asserted the guilt of sin was taken away, and by the former, we were entitled to eternal life. This opened the door to Antinomianism, which maintained "that the personal acts of obedience of Christ to the law being put to the account of believers, they are therefore reckoned righteous in him, for which reason God sees no sin in them; and they are not bound to confess sin, mourn for it, or pray that it may be forgiven. They need not fear either their own sins or the sins of others, since neither can do them any injury."—*Boone's Book of Churches and Sects.*

For demurring at this, and other opinions equally strange, connected with this subject, Arminius and his followers were counted heretical by the Calvinists; hence one of them expostulated with a Remonstrant, because he hesitated to admit "that a sinner is justified by that faith that believes that Christ had endured for him, by name, eternal death and all the punishment of the damned," a doctrine in relation to which Dwight says, "If the atonement of Christ consisted in suffering what those, for whose sins he atoned, deserved to suffer, his mediation did not lessen the evils of the apostasy, and of course there is, in the Divine kingdom, just as much misery with the mediation of Christ as there would have been without it; and nothing is gained by this wonderful work but the transfer of this misery from the guilty to the innocent." And yet this was the doctrine of the Belgic divines, and on this they founded the right of acquittal from punishment of those for whom had the best of the argument, he was surprised that he had not met the objections advanced against the thesis in a way more suitable to the importance of the subject and the occasion. Thus repulsed, he handed the proposition

Christ died; holding those to be Socinians who hesitated to receive it, inasmuch as they saw that any other interpretation of the atonement would open the way for the admission of the universality of the death of Christ. This will be seen by quotations from their works.

Maccovius says, "If Christ died for all, then he was a surety and ransome for all, even for those that perish everlastingly. And this will brand God with injustice for taking a twofold punishment for the same offences, when the first satisfaction might have sufficed."—*Mac. Distinct.* c. 10, *Disp.* 18, p. 35.

D'. Damman, who was scribe to the Synod of Dort, speaks to the same effect: "It is repugnant to God's justice that he should constitute Christ to bear the sins of all men and make full satisfaction for them, and yet ordain some men to bear their own sins in their own persons, and so make satisfaction for them themselves; then he should punish one sin twice, that is to say, both in his Son and in them that perish."—*Consens.* p. 63.

Vogelius says, "If Christ tasted death for unbelievers, he drank that bitter cup in vain, or else unbelievers must taste eternal death twice, contrary to God's justice, to the dignity of Christ's death, and to possibility;" and therefore this man says, "The Remonstrants who believe in the universality of Christ's death *are to be suspected of Pelagianism, Socinianism, and other filthy heresies."—Contra Ministros Campens,* pp. 125, 135.—*From Dr. Womack, bishop of St. David's, as quoted in his Arcana Dogmatum, Anti-Remonstrantium.*

The passages quoted in this note from the works of Arminius and Curcellæus are given, as they are translated in a work published in 1697, to show the growth and detect the progress of error, by a person who, in withholding his name, called himself "*A Lover of Peace and Truth.*" These translations are made by him, for the purpose of admitting the statements of the Arminians to be orthodox; and who, in relation to the views of Arminius on the subjects of grace and free will, as stated by him in his letter to *Hippolitus a Collibus*, especially exclaims, "What man can desire more I know not;" yet the reader will be surprised to find that while this is granted, it is only for the purpose of charging them with falsehood and hypocrisy by his attempting to prove that while they had orthodox sentiments on their lips they were Socinians in their hearts.* Revolting as such conduct may appear in a man who to another student, and it was debated on the 24th of February, and the 9th of March. On both these occasions Episcopius was again persuaded to take part in the disputation; but in each instance Sibrandus behaved toward him with the same violence and rudeness which had marked his conduct at the previous debate. While the fame of Episcopius increased by the superiority he displayed over the professor, and this would be gratifying to him, yet, as a matter of course, it was an occasion of deep mortification to Sibrandus, who henceforth viewed him with jealousy and hatred. Stung with shame, and maddened by the desire of revenge, he began to devise measures, says Limborch, which, had they succeeded, were designed to have prevented Episcopius ever being allowed to enter the ministry. What these measures were we are not informed: it is only added, that not till some time after their failure was Episcopius apprized of the machinations of the professor, although he had happily, by his prudent and irreproachable conduct, rendered them perfectly nugatory. But though we are in the dark as to the precise measures adopted by Sibrandus at the time alluded to, we shall present one instance of his envenomed feelings, as manifested against his successful opponent. Smarting under the pain of discomfiture, he adopted the following method to get Episcopius expelled from the uni-

---

* The reader should know that the design of all this is to lift up a warning voice to those who might be disposed to adopt the milder form of Calvinism which was first broached by Camero, who taught divinity at Saumur, and was more fully developed by his disciple Amyraldus, and now bears the name in England of Baxterianism; being advocated by the celebrated Baxter in his Treatise of Universal Redemption, and in his *Me-*

---

professed to be *a lover of truth*, yet this was the invariable practice of Festus Hommius and others, as will be shown hereafter, asserting that while Episcopius and others spoke orthodox sentiments, they secretly maintained opposite opinions; and in this dishonourable manner charged them with Socinianism; and Dr. Mosheim has contributed to perpetuate this scandal upon them by saying that the Calvinist party, at the conference of the Hague, offered to tolerate the Arminians, if they would give up certain Socinian sentiments which they held. If the proposal was ever made, which we doubt, nothing could be more unjust than the charge it contained.

thodus Theologiæ. In doing this he states the case of those who have made the attempt by saying, "that the Amyraldians, among whom they who are sincere in what they profess, as I doubt not but there are many such,—yet of these how many slide into Arminianism? And though they set up for men of a *middle way*, between the extremes of *Calvin* and the excesses of *Van Harmine;* yet on the turn from the former, they fall in so far with the latter in their concessions, that it's become impossible for them to make a just defence of what they hold in opposition to the other parts of the *Arminian* system; and therefore at last fall in entirely with them, [the Arminians,] and run their lengths." P. 3.

versity:—He waited upon the curators, complaining that certain persons, who were especially qualified for such a work, were tolerated in agitating and spreading through the university new and dangerous doctrines; and that this attempt was made through the medium of the public disputations and in private companies: adding at the same time, that the parties so engaged were distinguished with such capabilities, that he was fully persuaded that more suitable instruments for effecting such an object could not have been selected. This statement he meant to apply to Episcopius, of whom he did not scruple to say on another occasion, while seated at the table of a friend when several professors were present, "that in point of force of mind and argumentative powers, he was fully satisfied that Arminius was a mere child to him!" In consequence of these representations several of the students were summoned before the honourable curators, under pretence of being examined on certain charges of misdemeanour which were to be alleged against them. But when they came into their presence, instead of such charges being advanced, they were required to take an oath faithfully to answer and not divulge the questions about to be proposed to them. This being done, they were asked, "if they were not aware that certain errors had been broached and were spreading through the university; and whether some of the more learned students had not mixed in their company, and under the pretence of social intercourse, introduced certain doctrines as subjects of conversation, with the design of questioning their truth, while others of a difficult and mysterious character were proposed to be illustrated and explained?" And when they one and all answered, "that certainly nothing of this kind had ever happened to them," they were then farther asked, "if they had not heard that such was the case?" to which they again replied, "Certainly not." The curators, however, asserted that they had been given to understand, by eminent and credible persons, that such was the fact. Failing in their attempts to elicit any thing that might confirm the suspicions which had been excited, they then inquired, "if they were not present at the disputation on justification, and if so, whether they had not remarked that very strong opposition had been made to the usually received mode of presenting that doctrine?" To this they replied in the affirmative. Being then asked, "if they had not heard the name of Calvin slandered and treated with contumely?" they answered, "Certainly not." The curators, however, said that they had heard that such was the practice of some persons, and they solemnly forbade every thing of the kind; declaring, at the same time, that they were fully determined, to the utmost of their power, to maintain the opinions of Calvin, and charged them at their peril to speak disrespectfully either of his name or doctrines. Many other questions of a similar kind were proposed to them, but in consequence of the oath they had taken, Episcopius was kept in perfect ignorance of them, as also of the above, for a length of time; till some of the students found it difficult, as is usual in such cases, to keep a secret, and let out the particulars stated, by which means he was made acquainted with them.

In closing this chapter we deem it right to offer a few remarks on the manner in which certain writers have commented on the circumstance of Episcopius' disputing with this professor, making it a matter of serious complaint against him. Of the excellency of his moral conduct and religious character, none have dared to whisper even the slightest doubt; but by some Dutch writers he has been charged as a rash, hot-headed, imprudent young man, a statement which has been carelessly repeated by the English and other biographical writers. What degree of truth there may be in this allegation we shall not attempt to say, but we cannot help believing that it was his talents and boldness which were more offensive to Sibrandus and his friends, than the mere circumstance of his taking part in the disputation. Had he been, indeed, a rash, wordy, young man, who had laid himself and his system open to attack in a way that would have secured victory to Sibrandus, not a word had been uttered as to his imprudence or rashness in disputing with this professor, either by him or the admirers of his doctrine. And supposing that it be admitted, that it would have been more prudent in him to have followed the counsel of Arminius on leaving Leyden, and that of Antonides on his arrival at Franeker, not to take part in any of the disputations of the university, yet let the reader glance at the circumstances of the case, and then he will be disposed not to view the conduct of Episcopius in that light in which it has been frequently represented by such writers. In doing this, he ought to bear in mind the following circumstances, namely, that the thesis of Sibrandus was placarded on the doors of the college, in the way of challenge to any one who might choose to appear as a combatant; the manner in which Episcopius was beset shortly after his arrival at the university; the report of penal measures being about to be adopted against him; the loud and unappeasable calls from various persons in the assembly, which all but demanded that he should take part in the discussion; the ardent feelings of a young man just entering the path of fame, of whose talents much had been said, and from whom much was expected; and then, if the consideration of these circumstances will not justify him in the opinion of the reader, yet if he be distinguished with a candid and generous mind, it will not only prevent him from being severe in his judgment upon him for entering the lists in the first instance as a disputant against this professor, but also when he recollects that in so doing Episcopius had acquired great praise for the mental power and scholarship he had displayed, the commanding effects of which fixed upon him the attention of the whole university, and the greater part of the citizens; and that urged by the consciousness of his own capabilities in carrying defeat against his opponent, with the certainty of sharing the applause attendant upon future victories, he was induced to continue to debate, the reader, we think, will view these circumstances as palliatives, unless he profess to be a rigid moralist, who may pronounce our young disputant defective on the ground of the motives on which he acted, not being of the most lofty and excellent order. But suppose we concede this, which will only be allowed on the ground of being permitted to compare them with those by which Sibrandus was governed when seeking to ruin his successful antagonist, and then we will put it to the unbiassed feelings of such a man to say, whether Episcopius will not stand before him in a less dishonourable and discreditable point of view, than must appear the character and conduct of this professor.

CHAPTER IV.

Before we proceed to the principal subject of this chapter, the call of Episcopius to the ministry, it will be necessary to direct the attention of the reader to the political and ecclesiastical affairs of the Low Countries, as they existed somewhat before and at the period this event took place, in order to mark one of the causes of that opposition which was made by certain parties to his being set apart to the sacred office. The thirty years' war, which the Dutch people waged with the power of Spain, in defence of civil and religious liberty, and which their indomitable spirit and patient endurance brought to such a glorious issue, did not occasion an extraordinary change in the political institutions of this people, though it induced a new order of things in relation to the Church. The civil liberty and institutions, which the despotic spirit of Philip designed to destroy, the people of the Netherlands had long enjoyed; and so jealous were they of any encroachment upon them, that though the dignity and authority of their counts were hereditary, yet before they were allowed to enter on their government, it was required that they should first secure the approbation of the barons, the chief lords, and the people. For this purpose they visited all the principal towns and cities, when they swore religiously to respect the liberties of the citizens; which being done, the people engaged to pay the taxes necessary to support their authority.*

Long signalized by industry, which, as it brought the enjoyment of wealth and intelligence, so it generated a love of independence, which led them early to emancipate themselves from the vassalage of the bishops and nobles; and in 1300, the chiefs of the *gilden* or trades were, in many instances, more powerful than the nobles. Prior to the fourteenth century, provincial states were established, or rather renewed. The stadtholder assembled the nobles and deputies from the chief cities, and in conjunction with himself, regulated the affairs of the province. The latter shortly after assumed the power of convoking themselves.* Such being the political condition of the Dutch, before they cast off the authority of Philip, the political leaders of the revolt against his personal but secretly declared commands were enabled to carry on their opposition to his despotic designs, under the forms of legality, and throw the whole blame of the national excitement on the deputy of the monarch and the creatures of the court, by charging them with entrenching upon the institutions of the country, in direct opposition to the king's oath and engagements.

---

* Modern Universal History, vol. xxxi.

In finally disowning the rule of this bigoted despot, and establishing the independence of the seven United Provinces, "little change took place," says Sir James Mackintosh, "in the internal institutions"† of the Belgians when the prince of Orange was invested with the powers of stadtholder, and the nobility and the deputies of towns directed the government, having formerly shared a large portion of its executive department.

But while the civil government of the seven provinces was soon settled under the form of a republic, and greatly prospered in its various departments, this was not the case with the Church; which, since it had rejected the dogmas and domination of Popery, had become perfectly altered in its character and institutions, by adopting presbyterianism in its constitution and discipline. That the Dutch, who had been disgusted with the episcopal office, which they had seen abused by those who had worn the mitre, and when playing the part of political tyrants, in executing Philip's commands, had stained their hands with the blood of the people, should be disposed to adopt a system of Church government that was the farthest from papal domination in its princely and imperious hierarchy, seems natural; while the simple forms of Presbyterianism, with the equality of its ministers, were more in accordance with the character of the civil government. The reader need scarcely be informed, that this system admits lay officers in its constitution, and requires the authority of the magistrates to enforce the decisions of its consistories and synods. From this arose a question as to the interference of the magistrates in the internal affairs of the Church, and if allowed, to what extent it was to be admitted. A fierce struggle ensued on this subject, and the clergy were divided into two distinct parties upon it. Those who were the opponents of unconditional reprobation and election, and the advocates of universal redemption, were in favour of the magistrates having extensive rights of interference, and might be called the Erastians of Holland. The opposite party were the advocates of Calvinism in its most unmitigated forms, at the head of which was Gomarus.* Here was an occasion of conflict, which powerfully urged the disputants to enter the arena of debate; and while a difference of opinion in doctrinal points frequently contributed to the existence of dissensions among the ministers, yet this question was to a great extent mixed up with their quarrels, and added much combustible matter to their contentions. The right of the magistrate to interfere in the affairs of a Church like that of the Presbyterian, will be admitted by the stanchest advocate of religious liberty, when he glances at the power assumed by its consistories. As an establishment, they engirted all within their pale, and according to Baxter's complaint of English Presbyterianism, "they turned the communion of saints into the communion of the multitude, and corrupted the Church by forcing into it the rabble of the unfit and unwilling;" and then, by ecclesiastical decisions and excommunications, punished such as acted against what was called Church discipline. The most rigid of the advocates of the *jus divinum* of this system were for claiming the right to inflict ecclesiastical censures and punishments on persons who either erred in doctrine or conduct, without appealing to the government of the magistrate, save merely the calling him in to execute the sentence they pronounced against a delinquent. How direct an assimilation this was to Popery, the reader will see without any attempt being made to point it out. And thus, says Baxter, "I disliked the course of the more rigid of them that drew near the way of prelacy, by grasping at a kind of secular power, not using it themselves, but binding the magistrates to imprison men, or confiscate their property, merely because they were excommunicated." Thus Orme, when alluding to the Presbyterianism of England in Owen's day, says, "Its worst feature was in its intolerance, and determined and persevering hostility to liberty of conscience. Their most distinguished writers advocated the rights of persecution." This spirit, it is true, was bad in England, but it was awfully worse in Holland. This appears natural, from the circumstance of the men who were the advocates of persecution having been educated in the place where they heard theological lectures from Beza, who had written a book in defence of persecution, and from whence Castalio and Bolsec had been banished, by the influence of Calvin, for opposing his *decretum horribile*, and having trod the ground* where Servetus was burned by order of the magistrates, who sanctioned and carried into execution the persecuting measures of Calvin against him. And though much may be said in palliation of the measures of these men, from the spirit of the age in which they lived, yet this does not alter the fact of their standing before us in the character of persecutors. And so far did the genius of intolerance influence those ministers who were the followers of Calvin and Beza, that whenever any of the magistrates refused to comply with their wishes to persecute, they instantly branded them as apostates from the principles and doctrines of the Reformation. This was the case with the amiable and venerable Hooft, mentioned at page 40, who, because he argued against intolerance, and endeavoured to check these bigots in their career of persecution, and refused to dip his hands at their request in the blood of his fellow citizens, was never forgiven by them; and they had finally the pleasure of seeing this *Christian Cato*,* with several of his brother

---

* The writer of the History of the Netherlands, in Lardner's Cyclopædia, speaking of the early inhabitants of the province of Friesland, classically called Frisii, or more generally in their own language, *Vry-Vriesen* or Free Frisons, says, "No nation is more interested than England in the examination of all that concerns this corner of Europe, so resolute in its opposition to both civil and religious tyranny; for it was there that those Saxon institutions and principles were first developed without constraint while the time of their establishment in England was still distant." Vol. x, p. 32.

† History of the Revolution in England, in 1688, p. 306.

---

* This man supported the old papal doctrine of the Church being independent of the State; not indeed by a papal supremacy, but by collateral power.—*Lardner's Cyclop.* vol. xlvi, p. 182.

---

* This place is named CHAMPEL, as we find in the sentence passed upon this victim of persecution. It is as follows:—"Au nom du Pere, du Fils, et du Saint Esprit, *par cette nostre definitive Sentence, laquelle donnons ici par escrit, Toy MICHEL SERVET condamnons à devoir estre lié et mené au lieu de* CHAMPEL, *et là devoir estre à un pilotis attaché et bruslé tout vif avec ton livre, tant escrit de ta main qu' imprime, jusques à ce que ton corps soit reduit en cendre; et ainsi finiras tes jours, pour donner exemple aux autres, qui tel cas voudroient commetre."—Historie Van Michael Servetus, van den Heere Henrick van Alwoerden.* A large plate of this unfortunate man is given in this work, in the back ground of which is a small representation of him bound to the stake when he is being consumed by the flames. The utmost stretch of our charity cannot lead us to find an apology for this cruel deed, so far as Calvin was connected with it; for if it was not done by his direct appointment, yet as he was "in some sort the arbiter of every act and every thought of the people of Geneva," his permission of it stamps indelible disgrace on his memory. Calvin says, "that after the sentence had been read to Servetus, he manifested a species of brutal timidity and fear." We translate his own words as given by Alwoerden in Dutch, as we have not Calvin's works. "So soon as it was announced that he was to die, he began to appear greatly troubled—then fetched deep sighs—wept most bitterly;

---

and then, unable to restrain himself, roared out repeatedly and vehemently in Spanish, *Misericordia! Misericordia!*"—*Zie Calvyn's Werk van* 1597. (*bl.* 607, *a van* 1612.) Calvin certainly intends by this representation to hold him up to contempt for displaying such a want of manly courage. Perhaps he had not shown more himself had he been in his situation.

* Brandt says of this gentleman, that he was a man who by his wisdom, knowledge, experience, and inviolable integrity, had acquired great reputation, and was now [1596] burgomaster for the fifth time. We shall give a few extracts from his speech to his brother magistrates, counselling them not to concur in the wishes of the clergy, who were anxious to persecute a certain individual on account of some supposed heresy he had embraced:—

"As for the prisoner himself," he says, "I do not know that I ever saw him; and after he was in custody, I was informed by credible persons that notwithstanding his mean condition and charge of a great many children, he had always behaved himself honestly without being troublesome to any body, and that he was looked on as a man zealously concerned for his salvation. But I understand he was excommunicated some time since on account of his opinions. The Church ought to be satisfied with this excommunication as having done her office, without prosecuting the poor man any farther.—Ought we now to put men to death for crimes which the clergy call blasphemy, but of which they will not suffer the civil powers to take any cognizance? Besides, that word blasphemy is extended so far that it is made to include Papists, Lutherans, Mennonites, Enthusiasts, and, it seems, almost all that do not conform in every point to our own Church.—Perhaps it may be said that the Spaniards persecuted without reason, but we with reason; but senators and magistrates, distinguished by the same tolerant spirit, hurled from the bench of authority by Maurice when he joined the High Calvinists, in order that he might succeed more effectually in accomplishing his purpose of seizing the reins of government.

Prior to this time, this prince was the object of their hatred; as he was frequently engaged with the magistrates in checking the factious spirit of these men, and confirming the appointment of certain ministers to the pulpit, who had been chosen by the more tolerant clergy and the deputies from the States of Holland and other provinces: and so early as the year 1584, the senators of Holland found it necessary to enact a law that should authorize commissioners from their honourable body to be present at the synods of the clergy, as well as at the examination and election of ministers, with the right of voting in such cases. This circumstance will account for the fact of many of the grave Dutch statesmen frequently taking part in meetings, where the ministers

"Reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute;
And found no end in wandering mazes lost."

The opposition of the Gomarist clergy to this regulation had been frequently manifested on former occasions;*

---

every one thinks reason to be on his side, and none will want a pretence to proceed to the like cruelty. If we were to compare the opinions and doctrines of the clergy with the Holy Scriptures, what text should we find in the New Testament to justify persecution for the sake of religion? It is especially strange that those who strenuously maintain the doctrine of PREDESTINATION should thus insist upon persecution or forcing of conscience; *for if their doctrine be true, no man can avoid that to which he is ordained.* I can never consent that this poor creature should be hurried to the Hague and shut up in a prison, to the utter ruin of his five small children and his wife." This speech so far succeeded, that instead of the man being burned at the stake, he was only banished from the city, to which he was subsequently allowed to return, and lived in union with the Church for many years.—*Brandt*, vol. i.

* In the beginning of the Reformation in Holland, William, prince of Orange, and the States of that province, had a design to confine the election of the pastors to the magistrates of that place; but the ecclesiastics were so dexterous as to get the project put by. A national synod, held at the Hague in the year 1586, ordered that pastors should be elected by the consistory, and that they should

but the call and examination of Episcopius presented an opportunity for making a grand trial of their strength in opposing it, which they were determined to improve. They were goaded on to the measures they took against him, says Brandt, by the apprehension of his talents giving additional weight to the cause of the Arminians. This apprehension, continues this writer, had been excited by the fame he had acquired at Franeker, in consequence of his disputations with Sibrandus; the report of which had spread through the whole of Holland. On his return to Amsterdam, which took place soon after his last debate with that professor, the ministers of this city who had been the bitter and unrelenting persecutors of Arminius, soon adopted measures to show their dislike of this, his distinguished scholar. On the subject of moral and religious character, Episcopius was unassailable; but envy and bigotry are never without the means of annoying and persecuting their object. There are modes of assailing a man which, though not overt and flagrant, are, nevertheless, effectual in accomplishing the object designed, because they tend to point him out as a suspected person, and intimate that there is something about him which, though not definable, is yet of a doubtful character; and when once this is accomplished, much is effected in the way of ruining such an individual. How far the measures adopted by the bigoted Calvinist ministers of Amsterdam tended to this, the reader shall judge. Scarcely had he arrived, says Limborch, at his native city from Franeker, when the ministers and members of the consistory began to adopt measures in order to annoy and manifest their opposition to him. That the reader may see this, and mark their feelings toward him, it will be necessary to

---

pay this deference to the magistrates, to acquaint them with the election, and ask if they had any thing to object against the conversation and doctrine of the elected person. The States of Holland were so far from approving the Synod's orders, that they issued an edict that same year in which they declared their intention of preserving to themselves and the gentlemen the right of patronage. Neither did the States of Zealand stand to the canon of that national synod. In Holland, always when a Church became vacant the contest revived. The consistories maintained that the privilege belonged to them alone. The magistrates and gentlemen, however, would keep up the right of patronage.—Le Vassor, p. 14, part ii.

inform him that in the year 1601 he was furnished with testimonials from the consistory of the Church at Amsterdam, in order to his being admitted as a member and communicant of the Church at Leyden. During the vacations or recesses of the college, he was accustomed to reside at Amsterdam, and to attend the sacrament when it was celebrated at these times; and according to his wonted custom he had partaken of it so recently as the last Easter. After his final return from Franeker, a new order was read from the pulpit, by the appointment of the consistory, through which it was announced that no person, having recently left any city or country, for the purpose of residing in Amsterdam, should present himself at the Lord's table until he had produced his testimonials as being a member of the Church with which he had last communicated. Episcopius, not supposing that this regulation was intended to apply to himself, went as usual to partake of the sacrament. Shortly after, two persons, deputed from the consistory, namely, the minister Ursinus and one of the elders, waited upon him, and stated, "that as he had twice presented himself at the Lord's table without producing his testimonials, they were commissioned by the consistory to say, that as he must be aware that the order in question had been published, his conduct had, in consequence of his noncompliance with it, given great offence to several members of the consistory, who were led to suppose that he had neglected to comply with it in contempt and disrespect of their authority." To this statement and the accompanying remarks Episcopius replied, "that most certainly he had learned that such an order had been published during his absence, but he never thought for a moment that it had any application to himself, as he had been in the practice of attending the Lord's table for several years during his occasional visits to this city while residing at Franeker, and that even very shortly before he finally left that place he had done it without the slightest demur being made on account of it; and, therefore, he did not suppose it was requisite for him to attend to the order in question. Besides, he must take the liberty of saying, that to require of a student, who was frequently moving from place to place, that he should obtain new testimonials every time he removed, was imposing an onerous task upon him; and as it regarded himself, he thought that the rigid enforcement of the order was quite unnecessary, the more especially as he was so well known, not only to the whole of the clergy, but likewise to the lay officers and members of the Church: as were also the persons with whom he was connected, and whose conduct and behaviour were always under their notice and inspection." Nevertheless, he said he would comply with this order, and would present his testimonials to the consistory: and exhibited them at the same time to these gentlemen, as he had received them at Franeker, signed by the minister, Rudolphus Artopeus. Having so done, he ventured farther to state, "that he could see no reason for the introduction of this new order into the Church, beyond that of its furnishing an occasion of great annoyance to him." They, however, merely replied, "that such was the order." "That," he said, "did not prove it to be less the result of a plan to injure him; and he must declare that their proceedings had the appearance of a concerted scheme, and that the pretended offence his conduct had given, was not less a part of it than the other, which to him was the worst feature of it. Painful as it might be to make this assertion, he begged leave to mention some facts which went to confirm him in this opinion. In the first place, he wished to remind them, that for several years he had been accustomed to attend the communion here, a circumstance well known to the principal members of the consistory, who never offered the slightest opposition to his so doing, or required his compliance with any such injunction. The second was, that of the order being read in the interim of his taking the sacrament, and that, too, when he was absent. The third was, the suspicions of some persons on hearing the order, that it was aimed at himself; the result of which proved the accuracy of their conjectures." At this moment, the brother of Episcopius, Rem Bisschop, interposed and said, "that it was very evident his brother was the object of some base and treacherous design, for that he himself had attended the Lord's table for several years, and that during that period no such request was ever made to him, no not even when he returned from Konningsberg, after a residence in that place of fifteen years." Confounded by these statements, the deputies from the consistory assumed a milder tone, and appeared anxious to extricate themselves from the dilemma in which they were placed; and after offering some conciliatory explanations, the interview closed in a friendly and amicable manner; these gentlemen shaking hands with Episcopius, assured him, "that they merely attended to their directions, and that he might be fully persuaded that nothing was done in this business with a design to injure or annoy him." Episcopius then expressed himself as being satisfied, and subsequently declared that he would very soon—which he did—present to the consistory of Amsterdam the testimonials he had received from Franeker. The deputies then said, "that they also were satisfied, and assured him that should he at any time demand testimonials from their consistory, *they should readily be granted.*" This is a fact the reader must bear in mind, as it will show the duplicity with which they treated him when he was about to be set apart to the ministry, the evidences of which we shall have, though reluctantly, to notice in the conduct of men, whose office, as teachers of religion, should have guarded them against being led, by the force of passion and prejudice, to the lengths to which they were carried.

A few days after this affair, four persons deputed from the consistory of Alkmaer,* waited upon Episcopius, soliciting him to preach in the sacristry of their church, before the consistory and other persons, as a preliminary step to their calling him to be one of their ministers. But as he was aware that there existed great excitement among the inhabitants, occasioned by a dispute between two of their clergymen, Adolphus Venator and Cornelius Hutthenus, on the subject of the magistrates' interference in ecclesiastical affairs; and apprehending that he might be involved in the quarrel with the burgomasters and citizens, who had taken part in the debates, and were divided into two factions, he deemed it proper politely to decline accepting the invitation. The people of this place, being informed of the reasons that induced him to do so, were not without hopes of succeeding in obtaining his consent to become their pastor, when the state of their Church and the public mind should become tranquil; and therefore they were deeply anxious to adopt those measures calculated to accomplish so desirable an object, in order that they might apply to him a second time with greater success.

---

* This place is memorable in Dutch history, as being the last city that threw off the authority of Philip, and the first that offered effectual resistance to the Spanish army. Alva's natural son, Don Frederick Toledo, had just finished the siege of Haarlem, where the people showed that desperate courage and patient endurance which are the offspring of despair, which none evinced more than the females, 300 of whom formed themselves into a battalion with a widow named Kenau Hasselaer at their head, and bore a part in all the labours and perils of the siege, and performed astonishing deeds of heroism. Finding at length that relief was impossible, and that they must all be slaughtered if they surrendered to the Spaniards, the citizens determined upon sallying out of the town in two columns with the women and children between them, and though they were aware that the greater part of them must be killed in attempting to escape, still they preferred meeting death in this way, to being butchered without arms in their hands by the besiegers. Toledo, being made acquainted with their purpose, and knowing that despair might lead these brave people to desperate measures, soothed their fears by a perfidious promise of pardon.

In the meantime, however, an invitation, much more agreeable to his views, was forwarded to him from Rotterdam, by the senate and magistrates of that city. This was occasioned by the death of Swalmius, who had been the minister of the parish of Bleiswick, which was within the jurisdiction of Rotterdam, and under the patronage of the honourable senate of that city. Having preached before some of the magistrates and several of the members of the council, who were highly pleased with the sermon, he was immediately and unanimously invited to become the minister of the parish. On the following Sunday he preached also at Bleiswick, to the great satisfaction of the parishioners, who became anxious to confirm the invitation. This circumstance being known to the people of Alkmaer, a deputation from them followed him there, consisting of one clergyman and some gentlemen, with the design of inducing him to accept of an invitation from them; but as

---

They listened to it, and allowed him to enter the city, where he committed barbarities we cannot allow ourselves to detail. The Alkmaerians, aware of the fate of their neighbours, prepared for their defence, and were enabled finally to repulse the Spaniards.—*Grotius*, *Watson*, *Grimesthorpe*, *Grattan*, *Brandt*.

he had made up his mind to embrace that of the people of Bleiswick, they returned a second time without being successful in their application. Several of the ministers of Rotterdam and Amsterdam, however, had agreed to oppose his induction into the office of the ministry, and laid their plans with much art to accomplish their design. The former attempted to frustrate this call, by reporting that Episcopius was heterodox upon certain important points of Christian doctrine. The measure succeeded to a certain extent, as it alarmed the people; and some of the most respectable of them waited upon the magistrates of Rotterdam, and stated their fears to them; but these were soon removed, the more especially when the schout and several of the most distinguished members of the senate came forward to speak of Episcopius in the highest terms of approval. They then consented to confirm the appointment on the condition of its being approved by the classis. Here he was opposed by some of the clergy, and especially by Ruardus Acronius, minister of Scheidam, who insisted that he should produce testimonials in proof of the piety of his conduct and the soundness of his doctrines, not only from the faculty of theology at Leyden, but also from the consistories of Franeker and Amsterdam, and afterward clear himself from all suspicion of heterodoxy. The appointment, however, was confirmed by the classis by a majority of votes, and the 16th of August appointed for the day of his examination. Episcopius then returned to Amsterdam with a copy of the decision of the classis, for the purpose of obtaining the approbation of the magistrates, who were his patrons in support of the invitation he had received. But now the ministers of this city began to play their part, and use their influence in a variety of ways, in order to prevent the ratification of this call. Like their brethren of Rotterdam, they intimated that he was heterodox. Being made acquainted with this insinuation, Episcopius appealed to the magistrates, and requested that he might have an opportunity of defending himself, and proving the contrary before them. They complied with this request, but the clergy positively refused to enter upon the subject in their presence. As the business was by these measures held in a state of suspense, a burgomaster was sent from the magistrates of Rotterdam to those of Amsterdam, requesting their assent to the appointment, which was granted. By this time the period fixed for his examination had expired, and it was farther postponed to the 27th of September. As the day was approaching, Episcopius applied to the minister Ursinus, whom the reader will recollect as having waited upon him, and promised him, in the name of the consistory, testimonials whenever he might choose to apply for them. This gentleman, on this occasion, returned the testimonials Episcopius had received from Franeker, and which he had presented to the consistory of Amsterdam, according to his engagements when the interview alluded to took place, and referred him to the consistory for the testimonials he requested. But when in compliance with this advice he made application for them, he was informed they could not be given to him at present in consequence of the absence of the two ministers, Plancius and Roelandus. Learning this, he informed them that he was under the necessity of departing for Rotterdam, and hoped that his request would be early complied with. To which it was replied, that he might depute his brother to apply for them, *to whom they would be given*.

On the day appointed for the examination the classis met at Rotterdam, on which occasion were present two deputies from the synod, Joannes Becius and Libertus Fraxinus, the former a clergyman of Dort, the other of Briel. There were also ten gentlemen deputed from the magistracy of Rotterdam, namely, three burgomasters, and seven from the council, with the dyke-graaf,* and the pensionary Elias Van Oldenbarneveldt.† A violent contention arose between the members of the classis, on the propriety of permitting the deputies from the magistracy to be present at the examination, it being opposed by the Calvinist party of the members, they insisting that they ought not to be allowed to enter till the examination was finished, and then be called in merely to receive the report of their judgment on the case.

---

* An officer whose duty it was to superintend the banks or dykes of Holland. He was generally a person of distinction, as will be seen from the following quotation from Bayle, under the article Huybert. "The emperor, Charles V., being in the town of Zuriczee, lodged in the house of Livin Jacobsen de Huybert, who was overseer of the dykes."

† This gentleman was the brother of the celebrated Dutch statesman, John Van Oldenbarneveldt, usually called the pensionary or advocate of Holland. He was pensionary of Rotterdam, and was succeeded in that office by Grotius. Dying suddenly, Winwood, King James' ambassador at the Hague, knowing that his master interfered in all the religious gossip of the Low Countries, wrote to in-

In consequence of this contention these gentlemen were kept walking about the church for upward of two hours, the classis fiercely debating the subject all the time. During this period the magistrates sent in messages, at certain intervals, to say that they were in waiting to be admitted; till at length, their patience being exhausted, they sent to ask these divines, "whether they intended to make sport of them, and treat them with contempt?" This message produced the desired effect, and they were forthwith suffered to enter. The bigoted part of the ministers wished to exclude the magistrates from the examination of Episcopius, with the design of preventing him from entering the ministry. The arrangements they had made for the accomplishment of their purpose were disgraceful, and, as before hinted, exhibit a degree of duplicity one would fain not record. But as the late Mr. Scott, the great advocate of Calvinism, and especially of the members, the decrees, and acts of the Synod of Dort, eulogizes the conduct and piety of the Dutch Calvinist clergy, and in doing it insinuates the most unjust, because unsubstantiated charges of immoral conduct in the Arminian or Remonstrant ministers:* we deem it right to give the

---

form him of the event, adding that he was a *patron of Arminius*, and then piously concludes, "Divine justice has leaden feet, but iron hands."—*Brandt and Crowe.*

* The passage alluded to is to be found in Mr. Scott's preface to his translation of "The Articles of the Synod of Dort," in which he says, "that they were almost universally unsound in what are commonly called orthodox doctrines, and many of them far from conscientious in their conduct. Indeed it will appear undeniable, that the opposition made to them by the Contra-Remonstrants was much more decidedly on these grounds, than because they opposed the doctrines of personal election and the final perseverance of true believers as connected with it."* In replying to this statement, it

* When Mr. Scott says that the Remonstrants were not opposed on account of their objection to the doctrines of personal election and final

whole of this affair as it is stated by Limborch, that the reader may judge for himself of the principles and character of the men who were afterward the judges and condemners of Episcopius and his suffering brethren. It would be necessary to ascertain whether by these *orthodox doctrines* the writer meant those that were held to be such by most of the divines of the synod, or such as are now designated modern Calvinism. If the former, then we say they were unsound and so was Mr. Scott himself; and the principal object of his translation of the above work is, to prove that the synod, as a whole, was sounder than a portion of its members, and to demur at such doctrines as were taught by Maccovius and several other members of the synod being charged upon modern Calvinists. This may be seen by a note at page 92, in which he says, "There are a set of men in Britain, called Calvinists or evangelical preachers, who are said to preach doctrines justly deemed to be absurd and pernicious, a charge which cannot be substantiated." But though this may be admitted as true in relation to modern Calvinists, not so as to many of the members of the synod, which the Remonstrants proved by quoting passages from their works which the synod were ashamed of, and would not allow to be read, some of which were horrible in the extreme. Of these we shall probably give a specimen in the subsequent part of this work from the "*Declaratio sententiæ Remonstrantium, circa primum de predestinationis decreto articulum, ad Synodum Dordracenam exhibita*, 14 *Januarii*, 1618, *ante meridiem*."

As to the second part of this statement, which contains a foul calumny, we say that, had the writer been living, we should have asked him to have adduced, against any of the suffering Remonstrant clergy, proofs to support his charge of their being "far from conscientious in their conduct."* Were we disposed to retort, we

---

perseverance, he either did not know or must have forgotten that King James, in addressing the States, called Arminius the *enemy of God*, and Bertius' work on the apostasy of the saints a *blasphemous book;* which declarations were echoed by the members of the synod, and therefore they could not be very friendly to those who imbibed the sentiments of Arminius.

Mr. Nichols says that James declared that Bertius lied roundly in affirming the possible apostasy of the saints to be the doctrine of the Church of England. But Bishop Overal, who had long been professor of divinity at Cambridge, and who will always be acknowledged as a more competent theological authority, has justly observed, "Certainly that notion of *the perseverance of all those who have once believed and are regenerated*, about which there is such cavilling, was never approved by any of the fathers, but rejected by all antiquity; and more than sufficiently confuted by the experience of all ages; and it has only been started in these last times, being introduced into the Church by the jealousies arising between Zuinglius and his followers, and Luther."—A similar statement is made by Mosheim.

* We are aware that the Contra-Remonstrants charged them with immorality, but this was only done because they had no other means of justifying their cruel and persecuting conduct toward them.

appears that several of the ministers had so arranged matters, that Episcopius should not obtain testimonials from Amsterdam, yet intended to demand them, and on their nonproduction to annul his call to Bleiswick. Immediately on the entrance of the deputies, five ministers rose to depart. The former admonished them to remain, intimating that they had something to say to them. Three of them, however, persisted in withdrawing, while the other two, standing near the door, said, "that this was not a Church meeting, and that they had received commands from their Churches to depart from such assemblies." To this the deputies replied, "that they were fully aware that they considered themselves as being the Churches, and therefore had taken upon themselves to legislate and act as such." They then rebuked them for the manner in which they had treated them, and wished to know "if they were not ashamed of their conduct: that after keeping them standing without for two hours, the moment they entered they should rise to depart, designing thereby to break up the meeting, and thus treat them with the utmost disrespect and contempt?" They likewise bade them be on their guard, in respect to the authority they assumed, assuring them "that any attempt to claim the right of dictation would not be endured;" adding also, "that they should deem it proper to bring the whole affair before the States of Holland." Nevertheless as they still maintained that the meeting was made illegal by the presence of the deputies, one of these gentlemen said, "that he was utterly surprised at the refractory conduct of Beierus, who resided within the jurisdiction of Rotterdam, and therefore subjected himself to be punished by the magistrates of that place for his contemptuous behaviour toward them." To this he replied, "that he believed, in such circumstances, it was his duty to suffer for Christ;" when the pensionary keenly retorted, "Yes, indeed; so then if you are punished for contumacy and disobedience, Christ is to bear the blame of it! but

---

could tell at least of one of the *venerable members* of the synod, who was in the habit of going to its sittings not in a very suitable condition to be a judge in such an assembly, and on such matters as were there to be decided,—but we venerate the clerical character, and therefore forbear.

you, gentlemen, are too much in the practice of throwing the blame of all your bad deeds upon God. I would have you to understand, that as Christ has no part in such conduct, so he ought not to be blamed for your bad proceedings." Scarcely had these words been uttered, when the two persons standing near the door rushed out of the place.

The five ministers having thus departed, Episcopius, after some deliberation was called in, when certain charges were alleged against him through the president. Among others it was stated, "that Plancius had written to Acronius, saying that when Episcopius was examined before the curators of his college, he was found to be unsound in doctrine; and, moreover, that he had been known to defend the sentiments of Vorstius,* on the subject of God's

---

* This man, who was a native of Cologne, and distinguished for extraordinary talents and learning, was, nevevertheless, very singular and wayward in his modes of thinking. The opinions alluded to had been previously broached by him, and were subsequently published in his work entitled, "*De Deo, seu decem disputationes de natura et attributis Dei,*" which contains much objectionable matter. Bayle, though a Calvinist, admits that it would have been tolerated, had he not left the ranks of Calvinism, and gone over to Arminianism. Here was the front of his offence, as is clear from the sentence passed upon him by the Synod of Dort, which was suggested by James, with whose wishes and whims the reverend synod was pleased to comply, making use also of his name in it in a complimentary manner, which in one part of it runs thus:—"That the said Conrad Vorstius, beside defending the errors of the Remonstrants rejected by the synod, doth in his latter writings, especially in his treatise entitled, *Of God and his Attributes*, make bold with the articles of the reformed religion, which have, as well by the most high and mighty king of Great Britain* as by divines,

* To procure the condemnation of Vorstius, Le Vassor says, "The ambassador of King James had many intrigues with the Gomarists. One would have thought the business in hand had been a matter of great importance to his master's crown. But all the matter was to know whether Vorstius should be excluded from the university, or at most to consult whether the five articles of the Arminians were fundamental doctrines of the Reformed Church." P. 10.

"The books of this professor," says the above writer, "were presented to his majesty at such a time as he was diverting himself in hunting; and, after perusing them less than an hour, he sent a despatch to his ambassador of Holland, with express orders to declare to them, (the States,) in his name, that if they suffered such a dangerous fellow at Leyden, he would publish a manifesto to let the world understand the aversion he had against authors who dispersed such like heresies, and against those who permitted them to be publicly taught in their universities. This me infinity; and, secondly, that he had produced no testimonials from Amsterdam." In reply to these charges he said, "that certainly about six years since, which was some time before he had obtained the degree of Master of Arts, he had had some conversation with Plancius, while he was a schoolmaster, upon various subjects, and among others they debated on the subject of the influence of the body on the mind; and as he had not then begun to study theology, he presented his arguments as a student of philosophy, and that he afterward learned that Plancius had deduced from them unfavourable inferences; but that since the above conversation he had never spoken upon the subject, either with him or any other person." To the second allegation he answered, that in travelling with a certain student he had adverted to the affairs of Vorstius, in the way of repeating some reports which were in circulation concerning him, accompanied, it is true, with a statement of the mode in which that professor explained his sentiments; but more than this he had not said, much less advanced any thing in the way of defend-

---

been established as orthodox doctrines."—*The Judgment of the Synod holden at Dort, concerning the Five Articles, as also their sentence touching Conradus Vorstius, Englished out of the Latin copy, printed* 1619, *by John Bill.* A particular account of this man, whose writings created at the time so much excitement, may be found in Bayle, and in Nichols' Life of Arminius.

James, who, as before intimated, was much interested in the religious squabbles of the Dutch divines, was pleased at being considered an eminent theologian; and Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, who was a bigoted Calvinist and the principal agent in effecting the appointment of the Synod of Dort, took advantage of the weak side of his master, and urged him on in his polemical career. Little did this monarch think, that by fostering the spirit of persecution in these divines against the Remonstrants, and their opposition to the then existing government of the States, he was cherishing a spirit which at the Synod of Dort led several of the members,* if not to dictate, yet to concur in the murder of Barneveldt, under the charge of his being "a disturber of religion," that is, an opposer of Calvinism, and in England subsequently led to the beheading of his own son, Charles, for the same crime.

nace of his Britannic majesty was very peremptory and daring, nevertheless the ambassador punctually executed what his master commanded him. The States-General were somewhat surprised that the king should interfere in a matter purely domestic." P. 152.

* As in the case of Deodatus and others, whom we shall have occasion to mention hereafter.

ing his opinions: and that what he had said on that occasion was stated in haste, as he did not converse with this student more than a quarter of an hour."

On the subject of his not obtaining testimonials from Amsterdam, he briefly gave an account of the measures he had adopted to procure them, and then read a letter from his brother, Jan Egbert Bisschop, which related to the above business, which was to the following effect:—"That after his departure he had frequently applied for testimonials for him, and the answer he received was, that his brother Episcopius, when he returned from Franeker, had of his own accord, and without showing his testimonials from the Church of Franeker, presented himself twice at the Lord's table at Amsterdam, and that he must, therefore, be considered, not as a member of the Church of Amsterdam, but of Franeker. Besides, he did not in the first instance request of them more than that they should return those he had presented to them, given to him at Franeker, which they had already done; and having thus complied with his original request, they considered that the consistory had done all that could be reasonably expected from them. As, however, he continued to urge his request, saying that as his brother, on his return from Franeker, had most willingly shown his testimonials from that place to the consistory, when they were demanded, so there ought to be equal readiness on their part to present him with testimonials, as being the last place where he resided." Jacobus Rolandus replied, "Brother Jan Egbert Bisschop, we do not say that we would not give your brother testimonials, but as he came from Franeker, and did not immediately produce those he received there, and after he had produced them, did not wait for the permission of the consistory to appear at the Lord's table, but went there of his own accord; therefore the brethren of the consistory do not think themselves bound to present him with testimonials." He then asked them, "if they considered this act so criminal as to authorize them in excluding him from Church membership, and treating him for the future as a person unworthy of being received in such a capacity." This, however, they would not openly avow, and Jacobus Rolandus said, "He is a member of the Church of Franeker, the proof of which he holds in his hand, having testimonials as such; but as he did not at first show them to us, we cannot acknowledge him as belonging to this Church, and consequently must refuse to give him testimonials as being a member of it." Jan Bisschop farther stated, that he endeavoured by various arguments to persuade them to alter their decision; yet in this he could not succeed, and therefore concluded his letter with the following statement: "Such is the answer of the consistory, and it is evident they have resolved not to furnish you with testimonials; you must, therefore, make the best use you can of those you already possess."

Episcopius having thus replied to the allegations brought against him, he retired, when all the members of the classis unanimously admitted that he had satisfactorily met them, and fully cleared himself from all imputations of guilt implied in them. It was then asked, "if they should not immediately proceed with the examination?" The deputies from the synod replied "that most assuredly they should not continue during the examination, as it appeared to them that an appointment to the ministry was about to be effected in an illegal manner under the authority of the magistrates, and that, too, without the full consent of the classis, inasmuch as several of the members had departed, protesting against these proceedings, and appealed to another tribunal; and therefore they thought the business should be deferred until a synod be called, and their appeal heard." After much debating on the subject, the deputies from the synod called for a certain statute relating to ecclesiastical affairs, which was instantly produced by the gentlemen of Rotterdam, but when it was examined it was found not to contain the points relating to the business, as had been supposed by the deputies. The question was then again proposed, "Shall we proceed with the examination?" When the deputies of the synod said "that they must decline being present at the examination, because Episcopius had not produced testimonials from Amsterdam; and therefore they judged that he was very much suspected, inasmuch as the consistory of that Church would certainly not have withheld them without some special reason." To which the gentlemen replied, "You have already heard their reasons for not giving him testimonials, and why should you persist in demanding that which you know he cannot possibly obtain;"—the pensionary adding, "We are not certain that you have not thus arranged it with those of Amsterdam, seeing there was no other way by which you might disannul the appointment;" and this he said he was the more inclined to believe to be the case from certain circumstances which had transpired there, and which he related in confirmation of his opinion. He farther remarked, "The clergy of that city have behaved toward us in this business in a most dishonourable and disingenuous manner, in not stating frankly to us their objections, if they have any, to Episcopius being appointed to the ministry, the more especially as they have been apprized, for some time, of the call he has received." To which Becius, one of the deputies, replied, "that such a mode of proceeding was not usual in the Church." The pensionary then asked, "whether it was consistent with the usages of the Church, that Plancius should send, in writing, certain remarks he had heard Episcopius make about six years ago, on a subject which he had never named to him since? and that because he had once, while travelling in a public conveyance, introduced and spoken of the affairs of Vorstius for a quarter of an hour, that these circumstances should be brought forward now in the form of a charge against him? and he put it to them to say, whether the man who could introduce these matters as an occasion of accusation against him, would not have produced other charges of a more serious nature, had he been capable of substantiating them?" Becius said, "that they had heard the brethren who had withdrawn say that they had several things to allege against him." The pensionary then said, "If so, they are to be considered as unfaithful to their trust in departing when such matters were to be examined, or they were afraid that the gentlemen present should hear them, from a consciousness that they have no better foundation than those already brought against him." One of the gentlemen of the lay deputation then arose under strong excitement and said, "It is evident that there is an understanding between the deputies and the ministers who have departed, that they should throw obstacles in the way, in order to prevent our accomplishing the business for which we are assembled. But such conduct is against all order, and no assembly ought to suffer it. In the present case each had the right of voting, but the decision of the meeting must be governed by the majority; and for those who apprehended they might be left in the minority to quit the meeting, under mortified feelings, with the design to frustrate its proceedings, was not to be borne. Let each, therefore, consider that he is bound to submit to the majority; and those who may be in the minority ought to be satisfied that they have given their votes according to the dictates of their conscience: and if any person, while the business is being conducted, thinks that the meeting is acting illegally, let him frankly say so, and not depart to indulge in ungenerous and unfounded suspicions against the measures and members of the meeting."

After these remarks, the question was again asked whether they should proceed with the examination. Some of the ministers said they thought that the deputies from the synod should first be consulted, and their sanction obtained. Grevinchovius said, "By no means, inasmuch as on the examination they had no right of voting, and were only present on behalf of the synod as witnesses of the proceedings, to lend their assistance if required, and see that every thing was done according to the usages of the Church; that, during the examination, they might propose any question they thought proper, and interpose, by their authority, in order to prevent any altercation that might ensue."

It was once more proposed that they should proceed with the business, if the deputies from the synod would stay; but they declared that they were unwilling to remain, for the reason already assigned, namely, "that he who was designed to sustain the office of the ministry, ought to have good report from those within the Church, as well as from those without." This statement gave rise to a repetition of the former disputes, the pensionary saying, "that Episcopius had produced his testimonials, from the place where he had long resided, and no one here had dared to question the validity of that document; moreover, his character stood unimpeachable, and if any person was disposed to rob him of his good name, it at least behoved that individual to show reasons for his conduct. Would it not be deemed an act of injustice for a person to take away your cloak, and say he would not return it unless you could formally prove it to be yours? Would you not say to him, Friend, I honourably acquired it, and have had it for a long time, and therefore it is mine. Such a defence you would think sufficient to prove it to be yours to every reasonable and unprejudiced mind. In the same way we ought to judge and act on this occasion." One of the ministers instantly replied, "Such a mode of judging may be right according to your opinion;" to which the pensionary retorted, "Pray, have you a better? if so, name it." He said "he must bring testimonials of the soundness of his faith and the correctness of his conduct, especially from Amsterdam, as being their *alumnus*, and consequently the Church there must have had their eye constantly upon him. He ought also to produce them from the professors of Leyden and Franeker; for it should be remembered that these are persons not of the least importance in the Church." To this several of the ministers replied, "that certainly they had never produced testimonials from the professors, neither indeed were they ever required of them."

It was then said to the deputies from the synod, "Gentlemen, do openly and honestly say what it is that you can, or that you think that these professors can, allege against him." But instead of doing this they referred them to the ministers who had left the meeting. One of the magistrates then remarked, "You pertinaciously insist upon his producing testimonials from Amsterdam, and I verily believe that you, in connection with the minister, Smout, who has long been a resident there, have so arranged it that he shall not obtain them, and then make the nonproduction of them the reason for annulling his call, and preventing him from entering the ministry. Pray, do you think such conduct as this to be Christian?" To this Becius incautiously replied, "that if Smout was not at Amsterdam, still he would not be able to procure them." "O! indeed," exclaimed one of the gentlemen, "so then you thus avow your plots and deceitful actings in the business." This declaration fired the deputies, and they rose to depart. The magistrates, however, counselled them to stay, in order that they might report the transactions of the meeting to the synod, lest they should be charged with the neglect of their duty; assuring them, at the same time, that the whole business should be brought before their high mightinesses the States, who would be convinced by the report of these proceedings, of the contrivance of a plan, the object of which was to disregard the authority of the government, and treat with contempt the office of the magistrates. The president of the meeting also urged them to continue, declaring that every obstacle to the fullest investigation should be removed; and that they should be allowed to propose to Episcopius any questions they might think proper. "Let us," said he, "closely and rigidly examine him." But no; all entreaties were in vain, and they instantly left the meeting, which was about one o'clock in the day.

After the departure of the deputies of the synod, the president, at the direction of the magistrates, asked the ministers present whether they should proceed with the examination. The greater part of them replied, "Certainly," adding, however, "that the examination ought to be conducted in the most scrupulous and rigid manner, in order that they might, hereafter, be able to give a satisfactory account of it." One of them, it is true, named Adrianus Simonis, said that he was unwilling to be present on the occasion, unless the deputies would give their consent to it, or at least say whether they wished the examination to be deferred to another meeting. To which some of the gentlemen as well as the ministers replied, "that they could not cherish any hope that those persons who, notwithstanding the entreaties, expostulations, and commands that had been made use of to induce them to stay, had nevertheless persisted in departing, would be willing, at any future time, to enter on the business. Besides, it did appear that there was an arrangement between them and the ministers of Amsterdam, that by preventing Episcopius from obtaining testimonials from thence, or by throwing obstacles in the way of his justifying himself, although he was greatly desirous of it, much time would be lost, and in this way they would obtain their object by the Church at Bleiswick being left without a minister, and finally render it necessary to appoint another to the vacant pulpit."

A variety of opinions were then advanced as to the most suitable measures to be adopted, it being admitted by all, that they ought to act with that prudence in such circumstances as became Christians, that they might be able to answer to their consciences in the affair with satisfaction both before God and man. It was at length resolved that two of the meeting should be sent to the hotel, where the deputies of the synod were staying, who, they learned, had been joined by Festus Hommius, as he was travelling from Leyden, with a proposition from the magistrates and classis to the following effect: "That the examination of Episcopius should be postponed for fourteen days, if they would promise, at the lapse of that period, to be present on the occasion; and that in the meantime the consistory of Amsterdam should be written to, in order to ascertain what they had to allege against him; informing them, also, that his examination was delayed fourteen days in consequence of some persons objecting to be present and assist at it, from his not having brought testimonials from them." If the deputies agreed to this proposition, then the examination should accordingly be deferred; but if not, they should proceed immediately to it. The persons deputed to carry the proposition to the above gentlemen were the ministers Peter Cupus and Samuel Langsbergen. These gentlemen found that the deputies from the synod did not appear disinclined to concur with the proposal, on condition of its being signed by all the members of the classis, and receiving the sanction of the ministers who had left the meeting, which, they said, however, was not very likely. The minister Langsbergen, nevertheless, deemed it worth a trial, and while Cupus was to return and report to the magistrates, he went in search of the five clergyman, and was fortunate enough to meet with two of them, to whom he stated the proposal, and received the following answer from them: "That they would not consent to take any part in the business, unless the classis were first removed from Rotterdam; and that then, if any other persons were allowed to be present during the examination, there should only be two from the magistrates, and these well known for their attachment to the doctrines of the Reformed Church." This statement was heard with strong marks of disapprobation and disgust by the whole of the magistrates, who replied, "What!

do they indeed presume to take away the rights of our cities, by proposing to remove the classis from Rotterdam to some other place, and dare at the same time to dictate to us, and say who shall be present, and who shall not? Pray, where or when did they acquire this right to dictate and legislate? Do they think of introducing and exercising a new popedom among us? No, indeed! it has already cost us too much blood to get rid of the old one, to suffer the establishment of a new one."* "Gentlemen," said the pensionary, "is it necessary that we should delay this business any longer? We distinctly understand what they intend. It appears it was not enough that they should keep us waiting without for two hours, but they must now take upon themselves to say how many persons, and who may be present, in order, forsooth, that nothing may be done but in accordance with their views."

---

* These gentlemen, on certain occasions, carried things with rather a high hand, as the following circumstance will prove:— Hubert Duifhuis, [*Dovehouse*,] a person of respectable family, and formerly a priest of the Church of Rome, embraced the doctrines of the Reformation so early as 1578. He was a man singularly amiable and placid in his temper.* His piety was of the highest order, and he had the art of conciliating people of all classes and religious opinions, save those of the clergy who were the advocates of absolute predestination and persecution. He maintained that one brother had no more authority over another than to admonish and reprove him in love. He would not allow persecution against Papists themselves, and said to the magistrates of Utrecht, "*If you persecute men on account of their faith, God will never prosper your affairs.*" On the subject of predestination he could not extend his notions so far as some of the *reformed;* he therefore spoke little on that head, but chiefly on original sin, and justification by imputed righteousness. He was considered by the rigid patrons of Calvinism as unsound, and a latitudinarian for his forbearance and charity toward those denominated heretics; and when summoned before the consistory, whose authority he would not own, he was asked "if he had read Beza's tract on the power of the magistrates to punish heresy with death? Upon which," says Brandt, "he burst into these expressions, '*Is that your meaning? Then let not my soul enter into your councils; neither do I desire to have any communication with such people.*'" He therefore left them; and the people and magistrates protected him against all the furious attempts made to injure him,—for such they were,—of those who called themselves orthodox. He preached, say the historians of that day, with great zeal and fervour, and with a moving eloquence. In the year 1580, the prince of Orange, paying a visit to Utrecht, gave orders on the Sunday that a place should be provided for him in one of the churches where was the best preaching. He was accordingly conducted to hear Dovehouse. He was very much pleased with the sermon, and declared that *he had never heard a better*. This was

* If the portrait given of him in the Dutch copy of Brandt, and the lines placed at the foot of it, be a faithful representation of him, he must have been a most amiable, placid being: so much sweetness in a countenance we have scarcely ever seen. He was born the day before Erasmus, as is stated in these lines; and it is remarked of him, that if not equal in learning, yet he was equal in amiableness and piety to that great scholar.

Upon this statement, the whole of the magistrates resolved on proceeding, adding, "We shall then see who will dare to question the legality of the meeting." The ministers also concurred in this decision, and even those who had till this period showed some opposition, now declared that they were fully satisfied in their consciences that every thing had been done which could or ought to be done. Episcopius then delivered a lecture before the classis, on Philippians ii, 12, 13,—*Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do of his own good pleasure.*

As the evening approached, the farther examination was deferred till the next day, when Episcopius having given the most perfect satisfaction to all present, it was unanimously resolved that he should be appointed to the Church at Bleiswick, and he was accordingly confirmed in the call, and inducted into the office of the ministry three weeks after. The five clergymen who had left the meeting, finding that all their efforts to prevent his being set apart to the ministry were unavailing, endeavoured to disturb his union and happiness with this Church by sending a protest to the consistory of Bleiswick against his appointment, asserting its illegality, but more especially warning them against his doctrines. The people showed this letter to the magistrates of Rotterdam, who satisfied them by promising to shield them from all consequences to which they might be subject in confirming

too much for the high Calvinists to bear, and the ministers of the consistory formally waited upon his highness, and complained that he had by his presence at Dovehouse's church approved of the doctrines of this minister, who was not orthodox. The prince knew well how to play his part with these self-complacent bigots, and told them *that though there was nothing in the sermon that displeased him*, he would, however, go to one of their churches on the next occasion of his being in town; and then exhorting them to peace and unity, he dismissed them. *Brandt*, vol. i. *Grimesthorpe.*

the appointment. Thus was Episcopius, after having been introduced to this Church three times, set apart to be their pastor on the 17th of October, in the presence of several deputies from the magistracy of Rotterdam. He commenced his regular ministry among them the following Sunday, when he preached from Ephesians i, 22; and on the third of the following January, he was admitted as a member of the classis. But Brandt informs us that the hostility and bigotry of some of the protesting ministers did not cease, and one of them, named Acronius, who is supposed to have entered into an engagement with Peter Plancius, a minister of Amsterdam, to prevent Episcopius from obtaining testimonials, not only separated himself from the classis, on his admission, but influenced others to imitate his conduct; and in this way, not only declared that he was not to be acknowledged as a brother minister, but also produced a complete rent and schism in the Church among the clergy.

CHAPTER V.

Episcopius had not long entered upon his public duties as a minister, when his extraordinary talents as a preacher began to attract the attention of the inhabitants of the surrounding cities; and thus in spite of the opposition made to him by the bigoted Calvinistic clergy, he was acquiring a degree of fame that made him still more the object of their dislike; because they were aware that the fears they had entertained of his talents and learning giving additional weight to the Arminian cause, would be realized. The reader will recollect the measures adopted by the magistrates and consistory of Alkmaer to obtain his appointment among them. We shall hereafter have to notice the citizens of Utrecht, as having recourse to similar measures to effect the same object. The people of the former place, who before had been twice foiled in their personal application to Episcopius, for the purpose of obtaining his consent to become their minister, were now determined to make a third effort to accomplish their wishes, by applying directly to the magistrates and consistory of Rotterdam. They, therefore, deputed their minister, Venator, and three lay gentlemen, to wait upon these two bodies, to ask their consent to his being appointed as a pastor among them. To this request they received a positive refusal. They then earnestly pressed the loan of his services for a certain period, but in this they were likewise unsuccessful; and therefore were under the necessity of returning without effecting the object of their mission.

It was in the month of July, in the year 1611, that those ministers who had adopted the sentiments of Arminius on the subject of predestination, presented a memorial to their high mightinesses, the States of Holland and West Friesland, bearing the name of a Remonstrance, from which circumstance the followers of this professor and eminent divine were afterward called Remonstrants, and by this appellation they will generally be noticed in the subsequent part of this work. This remonstrance was occasioned by the persecution they suffered from the various classes where the Calvinist clergy were the most numerous, and the misrepresentation of their doctrines to the people. They, therefore, presented this document to the States, in which they gave an account of their doctrines, comprehended in the five articles, or points as they are called, and craved protection for themselves and those ministers who entertained sentiments similar to their own.

Such is the statement Limborch gives of this memorial, without entering more particularly into the circumstances which gave rise to it. He was induced, we presume, not to enter farther into the particulars of this part of the history of the Remonstrants, from the fact of his writing the life of Episcopius in Dutch, merely for the use of his countrymen, who were well acquainted with all the circumstances of that part of their history which he had omitted. But a gentleman who had been one of his students, translating it into Latin under his eye, deemed it proper to enter more into detail for the information of those persons in other parts of Europe who might be disposed to read it, and were not so well acquainted with the ecclesiastical affairs of the Low Countries. We shall only introduce a part of the additions made by the Latin translator, because we have already anticipated him in the passages we have translated from the German of Bentham's *Holländischer Kirch und Schulen Staat.* The reader will recollect that the above work, as quoted at page 21, says that the Dutch confession was first published in French in 1567,* and was greatly opposed by several ministers, as containing many innovations upon the belief of the Belgian Churches, which then generally adopted the sentiments of Melancthon on the subject of predestination; nevertheless, it gradually gained ground, till at length it was made the test by which to judge of the orthodoxy of candidates for the ministry.

The Latin translator of Episcopius, in his more extended details of this part of the history of the Remonstrants, gives an account of the origin of the Belgic confession, as stated in a letter sent by Saravia to Uitenbogaerdt. The passage runs thus: "I confess that I am one of those who assisted in drawing up that confession of faith, as was also Herman Modetus: but I know not whether there are any others surviving. It was originally written in the French language, by that servant of Christ and martyr, Guido de Bres. But before it was published, he communicated it to some ministers of God's word, whom he could find, requesting them to amend what they deemed wrong, to add what in their judgment was deficient, and curtail what might be superfluous; in order that it might not be accounted the work of a single person: but certainly none of those who were concerned in it *ever thought of it being appointed as a rule of faith, but that each person was to prove his own faith from the sacred Scriptures.*"†

---

* Different dates are assigned to this confession, chiefly arising from the fact of its being revised at different times, as will be seen from the following extract from the preface of an addition of it published by the order of the Synod of the Walloon Churches held at Leyden in 1667. *La confession imprimeé l'an* 1561 *ou* 1562, *selon quelques uns, etoit envoyeé a Philippe II., Roy d' Espagne, et á l' Empereur Maximilien II., l'an* 1566.

† This confession, which consists of thirty-seven articles, differs from the Augsburgian and many other confessions, in the point of predestination. It agrees for the most part with the confession of the reformed French Churches; those, therefore, that embraced it gave themselves, in imitation of the French, the distinguishing title of Reformed. Others gave themselves the name of Calvinists, because both the confessions, as well the French as this, are drawn

This statement of one of the compilers of this confession was introduced for the purpose of showing the right of the Remonstrants to object to its articles, and the injustice of compelling not only candidates for the ministry to subscribe to it, but likewise requiring those already in that office to do it, or excluding them from the pulpit, as was the case with several of the synods where the majority were Calvinists. The patrons of absolute predestination not only set up this confession as a standard of faith, but condemned any departure from it as they would a departure from the word of God, thereby making it of equal importance with the sacred oracles.* This occasioned the opposite party to question the validity of the claim to profound deference thus set up in its favour by the Calvinists, and led them to wish for a national synod to be called, for the purpose of examining these claims, and, if necessary, to revise it, and appoint at the same time a uniform mode of examining candidates for the ministry. Both parties wished for a synod, but with very different objects—the Arminians, to have the High Calvinist sentiments softened down; and the Calvinists, to have them confirmed. The Arminians wished the proceedings of the synod, and examination of the confession, to be referred to the States of Holland; the Calvinists, to be confined solely to the clergy. As the greater part of the gentlemen who held the government of the States, at that time, were Arminians, they wished this reference to be made to them, in the revision of the confession and catechism, fully aware that if it were left with the ministers, they would be made still more rigid in their terms on the Calvinistic points; and therefore would only consent

---

up according to the opinions of John Calvin. The reason why they did not follow the confession of Augsburgh, was partly because of the affiinity of language between the Walloons and the French, and the agreement of that of the Flemings and Brabanters with the Walloon speech. Nevertheless, the Dutch Reformed screened themselves sometimes behind the Augsburgian confession, because it was not so disagreeable at court as the Calvinian, since the latter sect was esteemed to be more addicted to tumults and uproars than the Lutheran. *Brandt.*

* Uitenbogaerdt says, "Some called it a second rule of faith, the Bible in miniature, and I have heard it stated in a large assembly that the Scriptures were to be expounded according to these two formularies,—the confession and catechism."

to the calling of the wished-for synod, on the ground of the reference being conceded. This was rejected by the Calvinist party, as they saw that by this means their object would be frustrated; and the synod was of course not held. As the classes, however, in some places continued to reject the Arminian ministers, especially those of Alkmaer, where they had suspended or rejected from the ministry five clergymen, because they either did not come up to their views of orthodoxy, or refused to sign the confession, as it was interpreted by the abettors of absolute predestination;* the Arminian ministers therefore deemed it proper, in the way of self-defence, to present the aforenamed remonstrance.

In this celebrated instrument they not only state the doctrines they rejected, as held by their opponents, but likewise give a statement of those they embraced and taught. Both were presented in five articles.† To this

---

* Among the five persons who were suspended from the ministry, was an ancient man, says Brandt, who had been a preacher at least 36 years, and had formerly quitted considerable preferments in the Church of Rome. Venator, named as waiting upon Episcopius, suffered the same fate, being charged with heterodoxy for refusing to sign the confession. And it is to be understood that the refusal was chiefly on the account of their being examined, not only on the *express words* of the confession, but likewise on the *Calvinistic inferences* which were deduced from them, by their predestinarian examiners. *Nichols.*

† Although we are aware that these articles have repeatedly appeared in English, yet we think it right to give them here, that the reader may have them under his eye while perusing this work. We shall give them, with few exceptions, in the words of Chamberlayne, whom we find, upon collating his translation with the original of Brandt, to have rendered them almost literally. We have three other versions before us, each of which gives them in a milder and less Calvinistic form; and as Brandt undoubtedly had access, if not to the original document, yet to a correct copy of it, we have thought it right to present as literal a copy of them as possible, in order that the reader may judge of the sentiments of the men who pronounced them heretical and not to be tolerated, and refused to hold Christian communion with those who maintained them.

In this remonstrance they first stated the doctrines they rejected, and which they summed up in five points.

I. That God, *as some assert*, of his own will, by an eternal and irreversible decree, had ordained some from among men who were not yet created, much less considered as fallen, to everlasting life; and the others, by far the greater part, to eternal damnation, without any regard to their obedience or disobedience, and that for the purremonstrance were appended the following remarks: "That many ungenerous and unfounded charges were alleged against them, accusing them of the design of introducing changes in religion, and being the occasion

pose of manifesting his justice and mercy; and for the effecting this purpose he had so appointed the means, that those whom he had ordained to salvation, should necessarily and unavoidably be saved, and the others necessarily and unavoidably be damned.

II. *Or as others taught*, that God had considered mankind not only as created, but as fallen in Adam, and consequently liable to the curse; from which fall and condemnation he determined to redeem some, and for the display of his mercy, make them partakers of salvation; and to leave others, even children of the covenant, under the curse for the manifestation of his justice, without any regard to their belief or unbelief. And for the accomplishment of his will, he hath instituted the means by which the elect should necessarily be saved, and the reprobates necessarily be damned.

III. That consequently Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world, did not die for all men, but only for those who were elected, as stated in the first or second manner.

IV. That the Spirit of Christ worked with irresistible force on the elect, in order to beget faith in them that they might be saved; but from the reprobates necessary and sufficient grace was withheld.

V. That those who had once received true faith, however they might afterward awfully sin, could never wholly or finally lose it.

Their own sentiments they stated thus:—

I. That God from all eternity hath decreed to elect to everlasting life all those who through his grace believed in Jesus Christ, and in the same belief and obedience of faith persevere to the end: but the unconverted and unbelieving he had resolved to reject to everlasting damnation.

II. That, in consequence of this decree, Christ, the Saviour of the world, died for all and every man, so that by his death he hath ordained reconciliation and pardon of sins for all men; nevertheless, in such a manner that none but the faithful really and effectually enjoy the benefits thereof.

III. That man could not obtain saving faith of himself or by the strength of his own free will, but stood in need of God's grace, through Christ, to be made the subject of its power.

IV. Therefore this grace is the cause of the beginning, the progress, and the completion of man's salvation; insomuch that no one could believe or persevere in faith, without this operating grace, and consequently that all good works must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. Nevertheless, the manner of the operation of this grace was not irresistible.

V. That true believers had sufficient strength, through Divine grace, to resist and overcome Satan, sin, the world, and their own lusts; but whether they might not through their negligence apostatize, and lose the power of holy, saving truth, the testimony of a well directed conscience, and forfeit that grace, must first be more of the commotions which agitated the republic; whereas, they only wished to concur with the wishes of the States on the subject of the revision of the confession; and as they had been thus misrepresented and persecuted by their opponents, they deemed it proper to present the said memorial to their lordships, the States of Holland, soliciting protection for their persons from all ecclesiastical censures and punishments, with the toleration of the doctrines contained in the said five points, until a lawful synod be convoked by the authority of the illustrious States, where, under their προεδρια, *presidency*, συμψηφισμῶ, *concurring judgment*, and moderation, they might be allowed to produce and state their reasons in defence of them; and that till then they and their brethren be not deposed from their offices, either in the Churches or universities, on account of the above five points; promising, on their part, to tolerate the opinions of those who differed in sentiments from them. But if the Remonstrants could not thus be tolerated, and allowed freely to exercise the functions of the ministry, they would endeavour so far to submit to their lordships' demands, that, if required, they would peaceably desist from the exercise of their duty as ministers, rather than be opposed to the public weal and the authority of the civil powers."

This memorial was favourably received by the States of Holland, and they published a declaration, saying that the Remonstrants, who were already in the ministry, should not be subjected to ecclesiastical censures on account of holding the five points, neither were those who appeared as candidates for the ministry to be examined on the subject of predestination and the consequent doctrines; or be required to subscribe to more than what was stated therein, if it were burdensome to their consciences. The States sent orders likewise to Alkmaer, requiring that the five ministers who had been suspended or deprived of their offices, on account of refusing to subscribe to the confession, as it was interpreted by the abettors of absolute predestination, should be reinstated. But the gentlemen refused to comply with the order of

fully inquired into under the guidance of the Holy Scriptures, before they could, with confidence and unhesitating minds, assert and teach it.

the States, assigning as the reason, *that ecclesiastical matters must be discussed by ecclesiastical persons;* and therefore, in opposition to their lordships, requested them to assemble a synod, where all such matters might be discussed. "This," says Brandt, "was looked upon as a drawing of the sword against the supreme powers." "In this spirit of rebellion," continues this writer, "the classis of Alkmaer was encouraged by the clergy of other places, especially of a great city in Holland, [Amsterdam,] which opposed the government so that a certain magistrate of the said city tells us, in his memoirs, *that the clergy hereby laid the foundation, and were, in a great degree, the cause of the ensuing broils and troubles.* The favourable reception of this memorial, and the concessions made to the Remonstrants, roused the indignant feelings of the Gomarist clergy, and in the following December, in a full assembly of the States, they complained of the said five points, asserting that they were ambiguous, obscure, and contradictory to the tenour of the Holy Scriptures; and declaring their perfect readiness, at any suitable time and place, to prove their assertions. Against these accusations the States judged it proper to allow the Remonstrants a hearing; and in order that they might not, upon so important an occasion, come to a hasty decision, they determined that twelve ministers,—six from each party,—should appear before them, and thus in the presence of the noble and mighty lords, the States, should hold a friendly conference with each other, that the matters in dispute might be examined into most carefully and seriously. This was the famous conference of the Hague, of which we have heard and read so much.

Of the persons who were selected by the Remonstrants to appear at this conference to defend their cause, Episcopius was one, who, when informed of it, greatly objected to take part in the proceedings of the appointed meeting; first, on account of his youth; secondly, from the consideration of his having so recently entered the ministry; and lastly, and chiefly, from the circumstance of the deputies from the synod being more opposed to him than to any other person.* But though he stated these facts, by way of showing the impropriety of his being deputed to appear at this conference, the Remonstrants, who well knew how to appreciate his extraordinary talents and profound learning, were aware that they had no person so capable of defending their cause, and would therefore take no denial. On this occasion it was that Episcopius, alike by the splendour of his eloquence, the depth of his learning, and the soundness of his judgment, excited the astonishment and admiration of that illustrious audience.* He took notes of what passed at this conference, and especially of the remarks advanced by the Remonstrants. "Some of these," says Limborch, "have been preserved in his own handwriting, and are in my possession at this time."

---

* Among these were Acronius, Becius, Fraxinus, and Plancius. The three former the reader will recollect as vehemently opposing

Before the conference commenced, the other six ministers, who called themselves deputies from the Church, presented a memorial to their high mightinesses, the States of Holland, which they called a Contra-Remonstrance, and on which account they were afterward designated Contra-Remonstrants, in opposition to the Arminians or Remonstrants. In this document they gave a statement of their own opinions on the five points, and opposed those of the Remonstrants. The latter afterward replied at great length to their objections, in a work entitled *Pressior Declaratio, A farther Account* or *Declaration.*†

---

his being set apart to the ministry, and the latter as using his efforts to prevent his obtaining testimonials from Amsterdam.

* Le Vassor, who does not seem inclined to honour Episcopius, except "as a man of uncommon learning, and a fine, subtle, penetrating wit," says "he defended the Remonstrants on this occasion to a miracle."

† This work contains a reply to the statement made in the memorial of the Contra-Remonstrants, in which they charge the Remonstants with attributing to the Reformed Churches, doctrines they never acknowledged. This the Remonstrants deny, that is, that they attribute them to the Reformed Churches, whereas they only present them as the doctrines of certain individuals, which they could prove from their writings, who would make them pass as the avowed doctrines of the Reformed Churches, and then, on the refusal of the Remonstrants to acknowledge them as such, cast them out of the ministry. Thus in 1600, at an annual synod at Haarlem, the Calvinist ministers wished to propose an annual subscription on the part of every pastor, to the confession and catechism, as a test to try whether any of them had changed their sentiments in the course of the year, and Festus Hommius drew up certain ques-

This conference being closed, the ministers on each side drew up a statement of their opinions as to the best method to be adopted in order to terminate these controversies. The Contra-Remonstrants pressed for the assembling of a synod, where the points in debate should be fully examined and decided upon according to the word of God. The Remonstrants, on the contrary, gave it as their judgment, that the preferable way would be, for the present, to allow mutual toleration, in consequence, they said, of men's minds having been inflamed for a length of time, and alienated from each other, occasioned by the agitating of the points in question, and that after a period of time they might become more calm, and thereby be the better prepared to enter upon the examination of them with less of party feeling, and with the happiest

---

tions in 1605, in the consistory of Leyden, for the same purpose. Hence the ministers had not only to sign the confession, but the inferences drawn from it on High Calvinistic premises. And in this way it was designed to ferret out all the Arminians from the Churches. It is a marvellous matter that while Mr. Scott seems to applaud this mode of proceeding in Holland, "yet," says Mr. Nichols, "some of his most intimate friends have heaped contumely and reproach upon my lord bishop of Peterborough, for proposing to the candidates for holy orders certain questions drawn up from the formularies of the Church of England. It is not my intention," he says, "to become a party in this affair, or to offer an opinion respecting the usefulness or expedience of such questions, in an examination of candidates for ordination. These questions, however, which were designed to act as a kind of touchstone to detect Antinomian candidates, were *vehemently denounced* when proposed at Peterborough, but accounted *perfectly lawful and praiseworthy* when adopted in Holland for the purpose of ejecting ministers who had been much longer in the Church than their annual inquisitorial examiners, and of preventing others from entering the ministry who had embraced the sentiments of Arminius." On this subject Mr. Nichols makes some strong remarks on what he considers the unvarying and unmitigated bigotry and persecuting spirit of Calvinism which we shall not record; and for the reason that we differ from this learned and laborious writer. For though Mr. Scott, the late rector of Aston Sandford, in his translation and notes of the preface to a work entitled "The Articles of the Synod of Dort, &c.," has, as we have already shown, in his zeal for Calvinism, attempted to defame the Remonstrant ministers, who were ejected from their livings and their country by the Synod of Dort, yet there are few Calvinists at the present time who either approve of the persecuting spirit of that synod, or of Mr. Scott's apologies for the conduct of its members.

effects, especially if the various synods adopted mild and healing measures.

The States, of course, wisely declined deciding on which side the truth was found, but expressed a strong desire that the opposite parties should cultivate the spirit of tolerance and forbearance toward each other, and confirmed a resolution they had previously published, which was to this effect;—"that as they never had intended, or did intend, that the opinions of the Remonstrants, with reference to the *five points*, should be imposed upon any body; so neither did they think fit, on the other hand, that any person should be burthened with opinions beyond the said points contrary to his conscience; but that both parties should live mutually like brethren in Christian charity, in the ecclesiastical employments they actually had or might have."* Unhappily, however, this counsel was not followed by some of the Contra-Remonstrant clergy, and especially by one at Rotterdam, by the name of Geselius, "who endeavoured to persuade," says Brandt, "the unstable multitude that his colleagues who were Remonstrants were not orthodox in their principles, *and that they ought not to partake of the Lord's Supper with them, as it could not be done with a safe conscience.*" This statement so far influenced the minds of several of the people, that they not only refused to hear Grevinchovius, who was one of the Remonstrants who took part in the conference at the Hague, but likewise absented themselves when the ministers Langsbergen and Hellerus preached, who, though they had not signed the memorial of the Remonstrants containing the five points, yet because they intimated that those who had so done should be treated with toleration and forbearance, they thus refused to sit under their ministry. The magistrates were very anxious to put a stop to the excitement occasioned by the conduct of Geselius, and exhorted and entreated him to live in brotherly union with his colleagues, and to avoid making a schism; but all was in vain. They then proposed that he and Grevinchovius should meet in their presence for mutual explanation, to which the latter consented. But Geselius avoided it by various subterfuges, as stated by Limborch, which we deem it not necessary to record. The result was, the magistrates deposed him from his office as a disturber of the public peace; and he opened a barn and preached to his adherents, whom he designated with himself *the persecuted Church.**

---

* *Brandt*, vol. ii, p. 105.

These separatists in the following May, issued a paper proposing the following question to other Churches: *Whether those that allow the five points of the Remonstrants ought to be esteemed as brethren, and suffered to continue in the ministry of the Church?* This was designed to try the state of feeling among the Contra-Remonstrants, who too fatally responded to the opinion it contained, and subsequently prepared the way for its manifestation.

About this time the magistrates and consistory of Utrecht, being fully apprized of the learning and extraordinary talents of Episcopius, which had been made so evident at the Hague conference, became very desirous of securing him to preach among them; and accordingly, on the 13th of September, in the year 1611, they gave him a call to become one of their ministers. This invitation was very agreeable to him, and so far as regarded himself, he was disposed to accept of it: but anxious to behave in the most honourable manner to the magistrates of Rotterdam, and the people of Bleiswick, he agreed to comply with their wishes, but only on these terms:—First, that they should secure the concurrence of the former, and afterward that of the latter. They accordingly made applications to the magistrates, who, in the first instance, peremptorily refused to entertain the proposal. Nevertheless, as the citizens of Utrecht were perseveringly importunate, and would take no denial, they finally consented to their request on the following conditions:—First, that it be shown that it was perfectly agreeable to Episcopius: secondly, that the consent of the members of his Church be obtained and produced before them: thirdly, that in the event of his services being wanted at any time at Rotterdam, the people of Utrecht should on application give him up for that purpose: fourthly, that if a conference or disputation be appointed to be held at Rotterdam, similar to the one at the Hague, they should then have the right of appointing him to assist at the same: and lastly, if at any time he was invited to the professor's chair at Leyden, in that case the citizens of Utrecht should consider themselves bound to release him, in order that he might be free to accept of it.

---

* "One Geselius gave the magistrates of Rotterdam a great deal of trouble. They deposed him. He kept private meetings. They then banish him. He refuses to obey. The magistrates publish a manifesto to the people in vindication of their conduct. Geselius answers it in his own justification. In short, had Arianism prevailed at that time, there could not have been greater divisions in that Church. Circular letters were bandied about to exhort the people to separate from the communion of the Remonstrants. The Contra-Remonstrants called themselves the Church unjustly persecuted. They met privately in a barn at Rotterdam. The magistrates caused them to shut the barn; but the Contra-Remonstrant party opened it again. Had the question been concerning the most essential points of the Christian religion, they could not have shown more warmth and zeal." *Le Vassor.*

Matters being thus arranged, the gentlemen from Utrecht, deputed to accomplish this business, hastened to Bleiswick, in company with some of the magistrates of Rotterdam, in order to induce the people of that village to give up Episcopius to them, in order to his becoming their pastor. But the former were altogether opposed to the proposal, and no entreaties could induce them to comply with the request of the Utrechtians, who, after making many fruitless attempts to induce them to comply with their wishes, were forced to return without effecting their object. But though thus repulsed by the inhabitants of Bleiswick, yet, as they had gained the concurrence of Episcopius and the magistrates of Rotterdam, they were sanguine in their hopes of succeeding, and therefore intended to make another effort to effect their purpose, at a future period. But in the interim, a more important call was made upon Episcopius, which completely cut off all their expectations. This was from the honourable curators of the university of Leyden, that he should discharge the duties of the important office of divinity professor in the college. His appointment to this eminent office was in consequence of Gomarus, the colleague and violent opponent of his late master Arminius, relinquishing his professorship. And though he may not be considered as actually filling the vacated chair of this man, yet as Gomarus' relinquishment of it left Polyander alone in the university to discharge the duties of theological teacher, it was deemed necessary to select another to be his colleague in this important work. The curators having made choice of Episcopius, informed him of their decision on the 15th of February, and on the 23d of the same month he delivered his inaugural oration before the honourable curators, *de optima regni Christi exstruendi ratione.** Although it must be admitted that his appointment to this office, when he was only twenty-nine years of age, was highly honourable to his talents and character, nevertheless it was likewise exposing him to the envy of those who, while they might be opposed to him on account of his theological views, would have that opposition strengthened from the circumstance of his being placed in a situation to which they might consider themselves entitled, either from their age or acquirements, or other circumstances which they might suppose ought to have given them a claim before him of being selected to hold so eminent a station. Hence the opposite opinions adopted by the two parties who saw him placed in the theological chair. His enemies, it is true, admitted his extraordinary talents; but that was only with the design of representing him as the more to be dreaded. "Hence Frederick Spanheim, a man of great parts and learning," says Brandt, "and subsequently a professor, said that Episcopius was a man of an acute genius, and armed with every thing that might serve to defend the worst of causes, and who, because he was much esteemed by some of the greatest men in the government, was, for that reason, the more dangerous." The Remonstrants, on the contrary, hailed his appointment to the office under an impression that, "on account of his being endowed with so much judgment and understanding, such learning and eloquence, piety, good temper, and discretion, something very great and good was to be expected from him for the benefit of the Reformation and Christendom, if he did not meet with too much opposition."

But this opposition, both as to its character and measures, soon manifested itself to a degree that must have blighted all their hopes of anticipated good from this appointment. The professor, Polyander, who upon the whole was certainly one of the most amiable and liberal of the High Calvinists of that day, felt himself awkwardly situated with his new colleague. Some say he objected to him on account of his theological sentiments, and others that he was jealous of his talents and reputation. Be that as it may, he early showed his disapprobation of the appointment, for when informed of it by the honourable curators, he said "that he wished some other person, or at least that John Arnoldi Corvinus had been chosen instead of Episcopius. Nevertheless, since the curators had so determined, he hoped that they would always bear in mind, that the business was begun and completed without his knowledge or consent; and this he could and always should assert. At the same time he would advise Episcopius to endeavour to live with him in peace and harmony, as he had heard that he was rather unsociable in his disposition, and fond of disputation and controversy. And this, he said, was dangerous ground, *for learned men could not easily brook contempt*."* How true this statement was, Polyander, at a subsequent period, gave decisive proofs, which we shall shortly have to notice. On the 21st of February Episcopius received his release from the Church of Bleiswick, through the classis of Rotterdam, who accompanied the same with the most flattering testimonials of their approbation of his conduct as a brother minister.

---

* On the best means to be adopted for the extension of the kingdom of Christ. See *Opera Episcopii*, vol. ii, p. 586.

During the delivery of his inaugural oration, certain noises were made by several of the students, which, though they were not very loud or of long continuance, were designed at once to interrupt and show their disapprobation of the new professor, which, however, he disregarded, and proceeded to the close of his address as though he had not heard them. Had these noises been made at any other time, it is most likely that the magistrates of Leyden and the curators of the university had passed it over, as one of those freaks these young *Dutch boors*, like other *young gentlemen* who enter similar seats of learning for the purpose of acquiring an acquaintance with the higher branches of literature, and mixing with polished and well bred society, are in the habit of showing off, merely for the purpose of proving that they are not to be put under those restraints under which it is necessary to place men who are either of plebeian birth or limited education. Determined, therefore, to stop these collegians in their proceedings, the magistrates, in an assembly of the senate of the university, stated that they had been informed that some of the students had agreed to interrupt Episcopius, and therefore they gave it as their opinion that an order ought to be published to forbid it. With this proposal the academical senate readily concurred. On the 28th of February Episcopius read his first college lecture on Rom. i, 16, in the presence of the curators, the rector magnificus, and several professors. On this occasion some slight noise was heard, but it was only of very short continuance; and at the delivery of two other lectures, on the same subject, the most profound silence was observed, and he was ever after heard with the utmost attention and respect.

---

* In the index of Bayle an article is thus headed, "The jealousy which reigns between your top preachers is equal to that of poets," which refers to the following statement in the body of the work. "Perhaps there is nothing upon which jealousy can cause a greater alienation in men's minds than eloquence. I know not whether beauty or poetry ought to be excepted. Two famous preachers seldom love one another, and frequently quarrel to the utmost rupture. 'Tis much if they can conceal their jealousy, and keep fair with the teeth outward."

Episcopius' situation as professor of theology was rendered difficult from two circumstances: his youth and the agitated state of the Church, in connection with the conflicting of party feeling. But that which was wanting to him in years was more than counterbalanced, says Limborch, by the extent of his learning, the force of his genius, the soundness of his judgment, and indefatigable perseverance, which rendered the duties of his station comparatively light and easy to him; while his prudence and circumspection enabled him to avoid the adoption of measures that would bring upon him the reprehension of any save those, of whom there were too many, who were constantly upon the watch to seek occasions of charging him with being unsound in his doctrines, and heretical in his instructions. Among these persons must be classed Festus Hommius, whom we find, immediately after Episcopius had entered on the duties of his office, waiting upon him, and congratulating him on his elevation, but with what sincerity we shall afterward see. This man, in his feigned congratulations, expressed his great pleasure at his appointment to the divinity chair, saying, at the same time, that he had much rather see him placed there than any other person, because he knew that both he and his two brothers were men of amiable and peaceable dispositions.

The following circumstance, as given by Episcopius' biographer, will show the state of feeling cherished on the part of several of the Calvinist clergy toward the Remonstrants, and the effect which their violent pulpit harangues produced upon the people. During the week of Easter, Episcopius, in company with Nicholaus Grevinchovius and John Corvinus, paid a visit to Amsterdam. The news of their arrival was soon reported through the city. During their stay, they went to hear both Plancius and Triglandius preach. On both occasions a vast concourse of people crowded around them; some merely gazed at them, while others were unable to restrain themselves, and both in the streets and the churches behaved to them in the most indecent and scornful manner.* A few days after, they were joined by Uitenbogaerdt; and the whole were invited by the Heer Brasser to dine with him, who also invited the following city ministers, Plancius, Jacob Rolandus, and Le Maire, to meet them. Rolandus declined accepting the invitation, saying that he was engaged elsewhere. Plancius and Le Maire in the first instance promised to meet them, but afterward declined, assigning the following reason for so doing, "that they could not dine with such disturbers of the Church without giving great offence to their congregations." We have no comment to make on such conduct, but leave it to speak for itself; only we would just remind the reader of what he has already been made acquainted with, namely, that Episcopius at this time was professor of theology, and that Uitenbogaerdt was chaplain to Prince Maurice, and, as a preacher at the court of the Hague, was constantly exciting, by his sermons, the admiration of one of the most splendid congregations in Europe: and one would, therefore, have supposed that the eminence of their station, talents, and learning, would have prompted these men at least to show them the marks of common decency and civility; but it is probable that their very eminence was the ground of their offence, while the conduct of these Amsterdam ministers may be traced, with apparent justice, to those feelings of jealousy stated by Bayle in the note on page 116.

---

* "The most learned among the Arminians were exposed to the imprecations of the populace. You may judge if they spared Episcopius, whose abilities were eminently known. He was insulted at Amsterdam, both at church and in the street." *Bayle.*

Another specimen of the violence of party feeling is stated by Limborch, as manifested by the French and Walloon ministers against Episcopius, in the circumstance of its being debated in the synod of the French ministers, whether the young Gallic students, sent to the university of Leyden, should be allowed to attend his theological lectures. It was, however, finally left to the prudent management of Daniel Colonius, regent of the French college, who, it appears, so managed the business as not to suffer the wishes of the more rigid of these ministers to be acted upon, who proposed withdrawing the young men from hearing the lectures of Episcopius. But while these students were allowed to attend his theological instructions, they would evidently see he was suspected of heterodoxy by their elders, and that to select any thing which could bring home the charge of it upon him would be acceptable to these divines. This state of things naturally led the young men to enter the university in the character of spies, rather than as pupils to hear and receive instruction; the result of which was soon evident.

In proceeding with the duties of his professorship, Episcopius entered upon an exposition of the second and third chapters of the book of Revelation, making as the ground of his lectures the epistles they contain, as sent to the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardis, and Philadelphia. Shortly after he had begun his remarks on the letter to the Church of Smyrna, a French student spread a report through the university that Episcopius had explained the words, *I am the first and the last*, with other subjects in his lecture, according to the mode usually made use of by Socinus; the proofs of which he arranged under ten articles, each containing points on which he asserted that Episcopius had departed from the orthodox standard of interpretation, and approached toward that which was adopted by Socinus. Episcopius, having obtained a copy of these articles, drew up a refutation of each in succession, intending to make it public if he should deem it necessary.

The rumour of this affair found its way to Abraham Schultetus, professor in the university of Heidelberg, who, when accompanying the Count Palatine in his journey to England, and staying at the Hague, had an interview with Episcopius and Uitenbogaerdt, when he stated that he had heard the report in question. Episcopius expressed himself obliged to him, as he had furnished him with an opportunity of vindicating himself from the charge, which he having done, Schultetus declared that he was perfectly satisfied with his statement of the case, adding at the the same time, "that he the more readily believed it from the circumstance of the lectures being delivered extemporaneously, on which account it was more difficult to escape the suspicion of those who were constantly on the watch to seek occasion of it, as he had proved in his own case about ten years since at Heidelberg."

The conversation then turned upon the painful disputes that existed in the Church of the Low Countries. This was continued in the most amicable manner for some time, Schultetus recommending them to adopt such measures as would tend to restore peace in the Church. Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius then gave a lengthened account of the means they had adopted to accomplish so desirable an object, expressing, at the same time, their perfect willingness to concur in any measure likely to effect it. They produced likewise facts to prove the perfect disinclination of the Contra-Remonstrants to come to any terms of peace with them.

Not long after this, Episcopius had an interview with the French student who spread the above report concerning him, and entered fully into a refutation of the articles which he had publicly shown in the university to his injury. The young man, on this occasion, expressed his concurrence with the remarks of Episcopius, who exhorted him at the same time, "to conduct himself hereafter more prudently and peacefully; adding, that such rash and unfounded suspicions were detrimental to peace, and could not be tolerated; that it was his duty to have spoken to him in the first instance, before he had so carelessly and unjustly spread abroad his scruples." The student frankly acknowledged his fault, and declared his deep regret at the circumstance, admitting that "by his conduct he had rashly disturbed the peace of the university, and that in the future he intended to act more prudently, and promised that wherever he had been the cause of exciting suspicion in the mind of any person against Episcopius, he would endeavour, as far as possible, to remove it."

The reader must already have been convinced that Episcopius' situation was a very precarious one. Suspicion, jealousy, and envy were constantly on the alert to bring him into discredit among the people; and neither his labours in the university nor the quiet of retirement were exempt from the attacks of enmity and bigotry, as the following case will prove.

During this year, says Limborch, there intruded upon Episcopius, first two, and then four persons, natives of Flanders, but then residing at Leyden, who unceremoniously and abruptly asked him, "whether he had declared that his views were in accordance with those of the new Jesuits, excepting as to the use of ceremonies and the doctrine of transubstantiation." Episcopius, not wishing to appear rude to these persons, by refusing to reply to their questions, answered, "Certainly not: nevertheless I am free to say that on the subject of predestination I accord with some of the Jesuits, but upon all other points relating to Popery I have precisely the same sentiments as the Contra-Remonstrants." Could it have been thought that a matter like this, so trifling in itself, would ever be noticed as a circumstance of a very grave and suspicious character? But so it was: for after the lapse of four years it was made the occasion of fixing a foul calumny upon Episcopius, which was widely spread in the States of Holland through the medium of pamphlets and other publications; yea, Plancius did not scruple to declare, from the pulpit at Amsterdam, "that Episcopius had said, in the presence of eight witnesses, that he held the same doctrines as the Jesuits, and that while he was at Antwerp, Brussels, and Louvain, he had visited them, and had been upon strict terms of friendship with them;" and other assertions of a similar kind. And when called upon to give proofs of what he had thus publicly advanced, he merely referred to the testimony of the publications already alluded to, in vindication of his statements. Shameful and wanton as was such conduct of this wholesale libeller, whose insults formerly tended to hurry Arminius to an early grave, it was only the prelude to fouler attacks upon the character and opinions of the subject of these memoirs.

CHAPTER VI.

In the year 1613, a circumstance occurred to Episcopius, with which we should not be disposed to trouble the reader, were it not that it may serve to show the state of party feeling in Holland at the time it took place. Being solicited by his brother Egbert to stand sponsor, or witness, at the baptism of his first child, but apprehending that, if he concurred with his request, he might be annoyed by Plancius, the minister of Amsterdam, who has before been named as the violent opposer of Arminianism, and of those who had embraced it, he therefore deemed it proper to decline attending at the ceremony. That he had just grounds for believing that this might be the case, a statement of the following fact, as it took place with Uitenbogaerdt, will sufficiently prove. This gentleman being present as a witness on the occasion of the baptism of his son's child, the minister, Plancius, instead of putting the question to the father and Uitenbogaerdt, according to the formulary drawn up for that purpose in the synod of 1586, which asks "whether they did not acknowledge the doctrine contained in the Old and New Testaments, and in the articles of the Christian faith, and accordingly taught in the Christian Church, to be the complete doctrine of salvation?" artfully changed the question so as to ask them "if they did not acknowledge that the doctrine *there taught*, and contained in the Old and New Testaments, and in the articles of the Christian faith, was the true and perfect doctrine of salvation?" Uitenbogaerdt, not aware of this piece of trickery, answered, Yes.

Scarcely had he got out of the church before he found out his mistake, inasmuch as he was laughed at and taunted as he passed through the streets, as being an apostate Remonstrant, by Plancius' friends, who, instead of being checked by the age, the talents, and the station of this distinguished minister, seemed, on the contrary, to enjoy the gross pleasure that this artifice had afforded them of making him the butt of their indecent jokes and mockery. This venerable man complained to this clergyman of his conduct, as he also did to the magistrates, the latter of whom engaged to prevent any thing of the kind occurring in future.

It cannot be matter of surprise that Episcopius should feel reluctant to place himself in a situation which would render him liable to similar attempts at deception; and he could not be persuaded to comply with the request of his brother till the latter promised him that the baptism should be deferred till Plancius' turn for preaching had passed, and Heyden's should commence, who was considered a more amiable man than the former, and had always made use of the formulary as it stood in the book, which ought to be used on the occasion. The way appearing tolerably clear, he finally consented to be present at the ceremony, and went to the church for that purpose. After the sermon they approached the font; and though Heyden must have been aware that the magistrates had declared that the alteration of the formulary by Plancius, in the case of Uitenbogaerdt, should not be allowed again, yet he could not resist the inclination he felt to tease the young Remonstrant professor, seeing that he had him, as he thought, in his power; and at once playing the part of Plancius, he asked him "whether he did not own all that was contained in the Old and New Testaments, and in the articles of the Christian faith, *and what was taught there*, to be the true and perfect doctrine of salvation?" After all that had been said in favour of Heyden, and of his using the formulary without varying it, Episcopius was not so put off his guard by it as to be insensible of the change he had made, and therefore, intending to avoid the dilemma into which Uitenbogaerdt had fallen, took care to answer in a loud tone, "Yes!—but as it is expressed in the formulary, that has the word *accordingly* inserted in it." So said his brother and some gentlemen who were standing by, whom they did not know; adding that they would bear witness anywhere and everywhere to his answer. This was too much for Heyden, who, being defeated in his design, kindled into anger, and began to use the most abusive language, calling him a bold, presumptuous, and impudent fellow. Episcopius merely replied, "that if he were not satisfied with the answer he had given, he would withdraw, and not assist at the baptism." The ceremony, however, was completed, and he bowed courteously to Heyden and five other ministers who were present on the occasion, but they refused to return the compliment. These gentlemen, it appears, had promised themselves a treat, for such an assembly of them, it is remarked, was quite unusual in the church; but being grievously disappointed at Episcopius' answer, they did not know how to suppress their chagrin and mortification. Their conduct, however, acted as a signal to the people of their disapprobation of him, and following the hint, they furiously assailed him in the church with the most violent and insulting language; even the dog-whipper seized hold of him, which was witnessed by these ministers without their interference; and though he returned to the place where they were standing, for the purpose of justifying himself, they only treated him with scorn. "Indeed," says he, in writing to Uitenbogaerdt, and giving an account of this affair, "when I went to them to vindicate myself, and endeavour to induce them to allay the excitement, I found them in such a temper that after they had heard me they treated me as rudely as the people had done, who, if they had known what had passed between us, would have used us much worse than they did; but, as it was, they saw enough to satisfy them that they had the ministers on their side, in the treatment they showed to me and my friends, and they fell upon us more furiously than before, and began to prepare to stone us as we got into the streets; and I can only attribute it to the special interference of the restraining power of God that we were not seriously hurt, if not actually murdered, by this infuriated people."

This circumstance, which happened on the second of April, excited the attention of the magistrates of Amsterdam, who, on the following day, summoned Episcopius before them, not with the most kindly feelings, in order that they might make inquiries into this affair, supposing him to have been the occasion of the late tumult. This was done in all probability at the suggestion of the Amsterdam ministers, who were so much opposed to him, and with the design of bringing upon him the displeasure of those gentlemen who had hitherto been his friends and patrons. When he appeared in their presence he was charged by them "as having acted very imprudently in going to the baptism of his brother's child, after he knew what had happened to Uitenbogaerdt in the same circumstances, inasmuch as he might have supposed that something of a similar kind would occur to him, and therefore he ought to have gone to the minister, and requested him to use such a formulary as he could have answered to without any scruples; or when thus interrogated, it had been better if he had been silent, than, by replying as he did, be the occasion of so much tumult."

To these remarks Episcopius said that "he certainly thought that there would not have been a recurrence of what took place in the case of Uitenbogaerdt for the following reasons:—First, because Plancius had been reproved for it both by the magistrates and the consistory, which must have been known to Heyden; and secondly, that as Heyden was not considered to be so captious in his temper as Plancius, he had therefore waited till it was his turn to officiate at the public service, the more especially as, since the affair of Uitenbogaerdt, he had invariably used the formulary as it stood in the books appointed to be used on the occasion." On the second point he observed, "Suppose I had been silent, how could they have proceeded with the baptism? Besides, my silence would have been interpreted into approval. The fact is, gentlemen, I could but do as I did; for had I not spoken, then they would say of me what they do of Uitenbogaerdt, whom they call a dumb dog, and one who dare not speak his sentiments, when an opportunity is offered to him for that purpose. And, indeed, I am not certain that the same tumult had not taken place if I had been silent." "Be it so," it was replied, "but one thing is certain, that the way in which you did answer was the cause of its taking place." "True," said Episcopius, "but that was occasioned by Heyden's not admitting that he meant his question to be in accordance with the printed formulary." "But pray," said a burgomaster, "ought you to expect others to accommodate their sentiments to yours? or alterations to be made to please you?" "Sir," said Episcopius, "I ask for none, because I want none; I only require that changes and novelties may not be imposed upon me. I do not wish Heyden to do any thing against his conscience; but by the same rule he ought to respect mine, and to have presented the question as it was agreed upon in the synod of 1586, and printed and placed in the pulpit for general use on such occasions." As several of the burgomasters still insisted that he ought to have been silent, he said, "Gentlemen, since you continue to assert that I ought to have been silent, I beg leave to ask your honours whether you consider the answer I returned to Heyden's question in the character of a crime, or whether a more reasonable or Christian reply could have been given, than that which admitted the doctrine taught there as a Reformed Church to be true, so far as it was in accordance with the word of God; and as this was my meaning, why should an answer implying this be considered as offensive and wrong? And I would farther state, that I do admit that doctrines are taught there which, in my judgment, are not in accordance with truth; nevertheless, I do not wish it to be understood that I intended to assert, or insinuate by my answer, that the fundamentals of Christianity are not taught in that Church: and answer the question, as it was proposed to me, I could not with satisfaction to my conscience, without such a limitation." "But," said one of the burgomasters, "if you had no objection to what was contained in the catechism or doctrine of the Church, you would have found no difficulty in giving your answer to the question in the affirmative." To this Episcopius replied, "Sir, I have given no man reason to say that I have any objection to the catechism; my answer did not regard what is contained in it, but what is taught in that Church; and surely I may demur at the particular opinions of any man or number of men, without disavowing the catechism or fundamental doctrines of our holy religion. There is an essential difference between admitting the truth of what is contained in the catechism, and what is taught by those who arrogantly and exclusively wish to be considered as being orthodox."*

One of the burgomasters then said, "Heyden declared he did not know that he had not expressed himself according to the formulary of 1586;—and moreover, he asserted that he did not know you." "Indeed," said Episcopius, "then why did he take so ill my answer, which, according to this statement, must be considered not only as reasonable, but in perfect conformity with the formulary itself. And as to his not knowing me, that appears singular; for, in the first place, he knew I was in town, and, secondly, he was aware that the baptism was soon to be celebrated, and he might suppose that I should be present; and if he did not know me he ought not to have treated me thus. Besides, as he never before proposed the question to any person in an altered form, and from the unusual number of ministers present, I could but think that the whole was an arranged plan to annoy me."

The magistrates then expressed a desire that the clergy would endeavour to adopt measures in order to promote peace and unity in the Church; to which Episcopius replied, "That is what I and my brethren who entertain similar views with myself are anxious to effect, and are willing to follow any counsels that will lead to it; but while those of opposite opinions use the inflammatory language in the pulpits they do, this is not to be expected." One of the gentlemen then said, "We wish you to forgive and forget the conduct of Heyden;" to which the professor answered, "Gentlemen, I am not naturally inclined to revenge, and from the nature of my office I am called not to cherish it, and am fully prepared to let all suspicion go, rather than retain it in direct opposition to the positive declaration of Heyden, who has asserted that he did not designedly treat me thus. This charity demands of me, and I promise, at the same time, to use my efforts to promote the peace and welfare of our fatherland."* To this the magistrates unanimously replied, "That indeed will be acting a just and good part;" which being said, Episcopius bowed and took his departure.

---

* The Calvinist clergy at the Synod of Dort, in altering the formulary used at the baptism of infants, took care so to construct it as to secure an admission from the parents and witnesses, that what was taught in their Churches was *the true and perfect doctrine of salvation*, as will be seen by the manner in which it was worded after the alteration. The second question of the formulary runs thus:—Of ghy de leere die in 't Oude ende Nieuwe Testament, ende in de Artijckelen des Christelicken Geloofs begrepen is, ende in de Christelicke Kercke alhier geleert wort, niet en bekent de waerachtige ende volkomene leere der saligheyt te wesen?

Thus ended the matter with the magistrates and the ministers; not so with the populace, who had been excited to treat Episcopius with violence from the conduct they had seen manifested toward him by the clergy at the baptism. Hence Limborch states, that in the afternoon of the same day in which he had this interview with the burgomasters, as he was walking in the church, a blacksmith accosted him with the most abusive language, exclaiming, "Is not this the disturber of the Church?" his wife joining in the same abusive tone also, said, "Such fellows ought to be sent to the Rasp-house." Toward the evening, Episcopius passed the house of this man in company with the burgomaster, Vander Werf of Leyden, when he again shouted after him, "Well, Simon, so thou art a professor, and I must have thee for my guide," with similar expressions; and when he saw Episcopius disregarded them, he was so filled with rage that he seized hold of a piece of red hot iron, and ran after him like a fury, and had he not escaped by running swifter than the fellow, it is most likely he would have been killed by him; and yet this was done in the sight of several persons, without any being disposed to prevent this man from executing his furious purpose. So far had the clamour excited against him by the ministers, operated to the destruction of every kindly feeling toward him among the people of his native city.

Insignificant as this affair may appear to the reader, yet at the time it was deemed of such importance that

---

* We have deemed it right to leave this word untranslated here, and in other parts of this work, as it has been borrowed from the High Dutch, or German, and naturalized by us. Lord Byron has the credit of being the person who introduced it into our language, though Mr. Montgomery, of Sheffield, had done it long before him.

Winwood, James' ambassador in Holland, who in his diplomatic character seems to have been wholly or chiefly occupied in reporting the squabbles of these divines, transmitted an account of it to the king, that he might be made acquainted with the whole of the business. We are not disposed to adopt the sweeping censures of certain writers relative to the unkingly conduct of this monarch in his polemical career; for, though it is admitted that there might be much that was blamable in it, yet an apology can be found for him in the circumstance of his having been early called to mix with the debates of divines from the influence the clergy possessed in the country he had just left:* still, however, he was not the person to interfere and arbitrate on these matters between the two contending parties. He was too much the creature of the accident of the moment,† and oscillating between opposing influences, he was at one moment won by the Remonstrants, and the next appeared as their decided enemy. This singular versatility in James' conduct will appear from a statement of facts as they existed at the time. At home and near the ear of this monarch was Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury. This man was a rigid Calvinist, and consequently an opponent of those who adopted the sentiments of the Remonstrants. Winwood, who, during his residence at the Hague, appears to have acted as the creature of the archbishop, encouraged the Gomarist divines to detail all their grievances to him, and he as readily forwarded them to the bishop or directly to James, who so far forgot himself as actually to stand opposed to the authorities of Holland, and foster the rebellious proceedings of these divines and their adherents, so as to shackle the hands of the government and dictate to their high mightinesses in a way that was deeply mortifying to them, as has been stated in the note at page 91. They had, however, no remedy but to endeavour to conciliate him. "And for that purpose," says Le Vassor, "Uitenbogaerdt and those of his party were careful to manage their interest in England, and deface the bad impression which his Britannic majesty had received of their doctrine and persons. It was much their interest to withdraw from their adversaries the support they expected from James I., and as Winwood had succeeded in prepossessing him against the Remonstrants, and the archbishop of Canterbury endeavoured to inflame the king's enmity, therefore Uitenbogaerdt and the rest resolved to confront the archbishop with doctors and prelates distinguished by their merit in England, and above all with the learned Casaubon,* for whom this monarch had a particular esteem. His majesty had embraced Calvin's opinion of predestination rather through the prejudices of his education than by reason and study; upon which account Casaubon and the rest found no great difficulty in persuading him to hear what they had to say in behalf of the Remonstrants in Holland. The latter made their advantage of this lucky minute. They transmitted to Caron, ambassador of the States-General at London, a memorial containing an accurate description of the true state of the questions in dispute between them and their adversaries. The memorial was read to the king, and he was satisfied with it. Nay, his majesty wrote to the States of Holland that his opinion was, that they should give toleration to the Remonstrants. The king's letter vexed the Contra-Remonstrants mightily, but did not entirely unhinge them. They sent privately a memorial to England to persuade the king that his religion was imposed upon." In this letter they attacked the States of Holland in the most outrageous manner; and though the king was displeased at their conduct in defaming their rulers, yet "the Remonstrants," says Brandt, "fearing that he might be still won to the Contra-Remonstrant party by the misrepresentations of Winwood and the archbishop of Canterbury, endeavoured to obviate the restless efforts of the clergy of Holland, who kept up a correspondence with certain divines in England, and determined to make use of the Heer Hugo de Groot, advocate-fiscal of Holland, who was then in England, about some affairs of the East India Company, in support of their interests, and who was in great esteem with all the learned men in that island upon the fame of his wonderful genius." "The States of Holland," writes Le Vassor, "had a mind that so learned a man should entirely undeceive the king of Great Britain, and confer upon the five controverted articles with the bishops and most learned divines of England. Grotius found that the bishop of Ely, the dean of St. Paul's at London, Casaubon, and several others, were almost of the same opinion with the Arminians, upon the points of grace and predestination. All of them gave him a favourable reception, excepting the archbishop of Canterbury, who was always prepossessed against the Remonstrants, and by consequence against Grotius, who defended them with all his might. He had several audiences of the king, who frankly acknowledged that he thought the sentiments of Calvin and Beza very harsh, and that according to their hypothesis God would be the author of sin. 'Nevertheless,' said the king to Grotius, 'if ye would have me to entertain a better opinion of Uitenbogaerdt and the Remonstrants, ye must first persuade me that these people have no inclination to Socinianism.' Grotius gave Uitenbogaerdt to know what his majesty thought of him and the rest of his party. Whereupon this minister, by Grotius' advice, wrote a letter to Casaubon to be shown to the king. The king was very well satisfied with every thing in this letter excepting this, that he spoke too respectfully of Vorstius." But though the Remonstrants were thus successful in obtaining the favour of James at this time, this versatile monarch was subsequently gained to the Contra-Remonstrant side, and not only gave his sanction to, but forwarded, all the proceedings of the more rigid Calvinistic party, in bringing about the Synod of Dort, by whose decisions the Remonstrant ministers were banished from their country, and their flocks exposed to the most cruel and unrelenting persecution.*

---

* See Sir Walter Scott's History of Scotland, vol. ii, p. 366.

† Nugent's Life of Hampden and his Times, vol. i, p. 23.

---

* This eminent man was born at Geneva, in the year 1559. He was chosen professor of Greek when only twenty-three years of age. He subsequently removed to Paris, and, though a Protestant, he was appointed librarian to Henry IV. After the assassination of that prince by the monk Ravilliac, he came to England, where he was kindly received, and James settled a considerable pension upon him, and gave him a prebend in Westminster, and another in Canterbury. He died this very year, 1614, and was interred in Westminster Abbey, where a monument was erected to him. He was a profound Greek scholar.

---

* "The condemnation of Arminianism at the Synod of Dort, is principally to be attributed to James; while, with an inconsistency

We shall now resume Limborch's narrative, in which he states that, in the year 1614, Episcopius commenced his excellent comment on the First Epistle of St. John. Long before this work was published, several unfavourable reports had been spread concerning it; and among the persons who contributed to circulate them was the professor, John Hoornbeck, who hesitated not to assert, both in public companies and afterward in certain works that he published, that the lectures delivered by Episcopius in the university of Leyden, on the First Epistle of John, were a mere repetition of Socinus' comment on the same epistle; and though this could not be fully seen at present, yet so soon as they were made public, he had no doubt but his statements would be found to be correct. But what was the astonishment the public afterward manifested, when, during the life of the said professor, I, says Limborch, "published this exposition, in which it was found, that instead of its being a republication of Socinus' notes, it was not only much more extensive and rich in its composition, but likewise totally different as to its matter, and actually contained several selections from the comment of Socinus for the purpose of being refuted by Episcopius, which he had done in the most able and masterly manner." This fact alone will prove to the reader the feelings of some persons, who, in relation to the subject of these memoirs, were determined, whether true or untrue, to make it out that he was a heretic, and consequently that they were justified in treating him as such.

The Latin translator, who has made several additions to the Dutch copy of Limborch's memoirs of Episcopius, with the design of giving a more extended view of the ecclesiastical history of the Low Countries, has here inserted an extract of an ordinance published this year by the States of Holland, designed to compose the dissensions which then existed among the clergy and the people, in relation to the points in dispute between the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants. We shall give it as it is presented by the Latin editor, with a slight addi-

---

which it will be difficult to defend, he protected the Arminian party in his own kingdom."—*Life of Sir H. Wotton, by Isaac Walton*, p. 166.

tion from Brandt, who also gives a copy of the above ordinance or resolution. It was drawn up by Grotius, and carefully examined by the States, word by word, and every thing studiously avoided that was thought likely to be offensive to the High Calvinistic party. It was then published with a preamble to the following effect:—"We, making use of the authority which belongs to us as lawful sovereigns, pursuant to the word of God, and the examples of kings, princes, and commonwealths, that have embraced the reformation of religion, have recommended, and do by these presents recommend, that all and every one shall seriously reflect upon St. Paul's exhortation, *not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith;* and upon what the Holy Scripture teaches us in several other places, as, 'that our salvation cometh from God alone, but that we ourselves are the cause of our own destruction;' and consequently, that the explanation of these subjects by the ministers should be such as to implant in the minds of the people and good communities upon all occasions, 'that the beginning, middle, and end of our salvation, and particularly our faith, is not to be ascribed to the natural strength and operation of man, but only to the undeserved grace of God in Christ Jesus our Saviour;—that almighty God has made no man for perdition,—compelled none to sin,—nor does invite any one to salvation to whom he has absolutely decreed not to grant it.' And although it be the custom (which we allow) in the universities, among the learned and those who are ministers of God's holy word, to confer and dispute in a friendly manner, in their assemblies with each other, about the meaning of certain passages in Scripture relating to the said doctrine of predestination and the points depending on it, in doing which there may happen a diversity of sentiments, as has also happened both in ancient and modern times, among learned and godly men,—yet do we not think fit that these difficult controversies, from whence, contrary to our orders and intentions, absurd and extravagant interpretations have arisen, should be vented publicly, or in the pulpit, or in any other manner spread among the common people. Nor will we ever endure that those ministers be molested who go no farther in preaching or professing, than—'that God Almighty has, from all eternity, according to his good pleasure, founded on Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, elected to eternal salvation those who, through the unmerited grace and operation of the Holy Ghost, do believe on our Lord Jesus, and persevere to the end in the same faith, through the like unmerited grace.' And on the contrary, 'that God has rejected to destruction those who will not believe in Jesus Christ, and persevere in the same unbelief to the end:' or that they shall be obliged to preach or enter deeper into these mysteries; the said doctrines being sufficient, as we think, for salvation and Christian edification."

The Dutch, before they published this edict, sent it over to King James for his examination, whose approval of it Casaubon thus stated in a letter to Grotius:—"The manner in which it is conceived appears to the king and others to be equally removed from the two opposite extremes of Manicheism and Pelagianism. The necessity of grace is therein established without encouraging remissness and negligence in good works."

"This testimony of James' approval of this edict," says Le Vassor, "greatly enraged the Contra-Remonstrants, and they endeavoured to neutralize its effects, by producing letters from England importing that neither the king, nor the persons of the highest dignity in the Church of England, did approve of the edict and conduct of the States of Holland. However, the testimony of Casaubon, who had himself discoursed with the king and the prelates upon the subject, seems preferable to the anonymous letters alleged by the Contra-Remonstrants. This edict, concerted with so much care for giving all parties satisfaction, was so far from allaying the storm that had continued so long, that it grew more violent than before. Some of the Contra-Remonstrant ministers published books to persuade the people that they ought not to submit to the edict. They publicly arraigned the States for favouring Popery, and introducing an impious doctrine into the United Provinces. Uitenbogaerdt wrote in defence of the edict, but the Contra-Remonstrants persisted in their opposition to it, and resolved to have no more communion with the Remonstrants, and had their meetings apart in several places."*

Although the perpetual opposition Episcopius met with from the Contra-Remonstrant clergy must have been a source of great annoyance to him, yet it was alleviated by the circumstance of his being greatly esteemed, and his extraordinary talents as a preacher held in high consideration by the more respectable classes of the community. This will appear from the fact of the magistrates of Leyden having deliberated in the year 1615 upon the propriety of requesting him to take upon himself the usual duties of the ministry; that is, by regularly preaching in their city on the Sabbath day. This was a very unusual request, and one for which the magistrates had no precedent, as the duties of the college were generally supposed to furnish sufficient employment for the person who was called to sustain the office of theological professor. Nevertheless, these civic authorities deemed it proper to make the proposal to him, and he was accordingly sent for, and in the presence of these gentlemen was informed of their wish by the pensionary of the city. In answer to this request, the professor expressed himself as being willing to oblige them, but intimated at the same time his fears as to the practicability of complying with their wishes, and for the following reasons:—First, that his academical duties and engagements were so numerous as to preclude the possibility of his preaching regularly in common with the other ministers who were not so occupied. And, secondly, he feared that his compliance with their request would expose him to the disapprobation of certain other cities, and especially of the Flemish consistory, which had frequently urged him to assist them in the same way, and to which he had invariably given a denial. And, thirdly, if it were seen that he could thus frequently preach, and at the same time discharge the duties of his professorship, he had reason to apprehend, from what had already come under his notice, that he should be annoyed by frequent applications to supply other Churches. But while he thus declined engaging to discharge the regular duties of the ministry, nevertheless he stated his readiness to assist his brethren on their application to him, or to preach at any time when the magistrates might deem it proper to call upon him so to do; but beyond that, unless it could be shown that there was absolute necessity for it, or they peremptorily required it of him, he must beg leave to say that he could not promise to comply with their request. The pensionary then said on the part of the magistrates, "that although they certainly were anxious that he should regularly preach in their city, yet they would by no means urge it upon him in direct opposition to his wishes and feelings." Nevertheless, as he had promised, he did very frequently preach, not only in Leyden but likewise in several neighbouring places, to the great satisfaction of many of the people.

---

* Le Vassor, part ii, p. 23.

But while, as we have already intimated, these indications of the approbation of the more respectable classes of his countrymen must have been pleasing to Episcopius, and have enabled him to bear up against the tide of opposition that set in against him from the more bigoted of the Calvinist clergy, yet the reader must have been convinced before this time that his situation was far from being pleasing, in consequence of the incessant attacks of these violent spirits. An instance we have now to advance will show the justice of this statement. During the college recess of this year, which took place in August, he deemed it right to occupy the vacant period in taking a trip to Paris for the purpose of seeing the French capital. While staying there, he unexpectedly met with the minister, Cloppenburg, who, it appears, was as much unacquainted with Episcopius' visit to Paris as the latter was of the former being in that city. The moment he saw this man, well knowing his virulent temper and suspicious disposition, he at once predicted that he would seek to make his visit to France an occasion of venting his ill humour, by surmising some evil as to the design of his journey, and carry home an injurious report of him. And so deeply was he impressed with these anticipations, that he could not forbear stating them to the Rev. Jason Van Byland, chaplain to the embassy of the high and mighty lords, the States-General, to the court of France, who was in company with him when he met Cloppenburg. As he anticipated, so the event actually took place, and proved the correctness of his conjecture, as will appear from the subsequent proceedings of this man. Scarcely had Episcopius returned to Holland, when he found that certain persons began to utter strange surmises as to the object of his journey. Plancius, his old tormentor, judging this to be a favourable opportunity for attacking him, did not scruple to rumour it abroad that he had been in constant correspondence with the Jesuits, and especially with Peter Cotton,* the most distinguished of them, he being confessor to Louis XIII.; and that the object of his communications with these persons was of a character most traitorous to his country, and injurious to the reformed religion. He farther declared that he had constantly avoided the presence of the minister, Peter Du Moulin. Other persons, influenced by the same feelings toward Episcopius, gave another version of this part of the report, and said that this minister, aware of his dangerous and treacherous proceedings in holding clandestine correspondence with persons who were the enemies of his country and the reformed religion, refused to allow him to be introduced to him. And although the malignity and grossness of these statements were such as to lead one to suppose that they would have prevented their reception among the Dutch, nevertheless they were widely circulated, and likely to be very injurious to him. Never, as the reader will believe, was calumny more foul and false, for, during Episcopius' stay in Paris, he never saw Cotton, the celebrated Jesuit, but by chance, and that was as he was leaving the king and stepping into his coach. With regard to the minister, Du Moulin, he had twice gone to his house for the purpose of waiting upon him, but on both occasions that gentleman was from home.

Although Episcopius would undoubtedly, so far as regarded his own feelings, look upon this report and those who originated it in the way the whole affair merited, yet as he was quite aware that the parties who had recourse to such a proceeding to injure him calculated upon its effects on those for whom it had been contrived, that is to say, the mob, he deemed it right to adopt measures which would at once extinguish the report, and discomfit his adversaries. He therefore wrote to the minister, Jason Van Byland,* saying that the fears he had stated to him when he met Cloppenburg had been realized, as to the probability of this man endeavouring to make his visit to Paris an occasion of rendering him suspected with the people; and, detailing to him at the same time the character of the reports which were spread through Holland by his means and those who adopted them, he requested him to furnish him with a letter exculpatory of his conduct, and thus clear him of the charges alleged against him. This Byland most readily did. Episcopius deemed it proper likewise to inform the ambassador of the malignant proceedings of those in Holland against him, on account of his visit to France, who readily furnished him with the following letter under his own hand, to which he appended the seals of his office:—

---

* According to the editors of the *Nouveau Dictionaire Historique*. "Il fut appelé à la cour de *Henri IV.*, à la prière du fameux *Lesdiguières* qu'il avòit converti. Le roi, satisfait de son esprit, ainsi que de ses mœurs et de sa conversation, lui confia sa conscience." "Après la mort à jamais dèplorable de ce grand prince, *Cotton* fut confesseur de *Louis XIII.* son fils."—*Article Cotton, tome quatrieme.*

"WE, GEDEON van den BOETSELER and ASPEREN, BARON of LANGERICK, LORD of NEWPORT, CARNIS, &c., ambassador from the high and mighty lords, the States-General of the United Netherlands to the court of France,—having understood from certain letters sent from Holland to our chaplain, the Rev. Jason Van Byland, that some malicious and lying persons residing there have declared, and caused it to be publicly reported, that the venerable and learned Episcopius, professor of theology in the university of Leyden, who in the month of August last was visiting Paris, did, during his stay in this city, form an acquaintance with some Jesuits, and especially with Peter Cotton, with whom he held a secret correspondence, the design of which was fraught with danger to our country: and, moreover, that the aforesaid Professor Episcopius did evade and shun the presence and company of Peter Du Moulin; we, therefore, deeming it our duty, in defence of the truth, and to vindicate the character and fame of the aforesaid Episcopius from all base suspicions and foul calumnies, do testify, with a clear conscience, to all and every one who shall see these our letters patent, or hear them read, that these rumours are false and slanderous; and that this same gentleman never did associate with any Jesuits, Papists, monks, or any other persons attached to the Roman Catholic religion; but on the contrary acted most circumspectly and prudently, and scrupled even to visit any of their churches and colleges, which our chaplain, the Rev. Jason Van Byland, can witness, who was his constant attendant during his short stay in Paris. And we farther declare, that so far from Episcopius' evincing reluctance to go to the house of Peter Du Moulin, and avoiding the possibility of an interview with that minister, he, on the contrary, did twice, in company with our chaplain, go to the house of that gentleman, but on both occasions he was disappointed in not meeting with him at home. And when he was subsequently informed that we had invited the minister, Du Moulin, to dine with us, he greatly rejoiced at the circumstance, hoping thus to have an interview with him. But in this instance, being the third time, he was also disappointed, inasmuch as on the day appointed for him to wait upon us, an unexpected circumstance happened which prevented his complying with our invitation; and as the period had arrived for Episcopius to take his departure, to which he was more especially induced by the intestine commotions that then existed in this city, he was under the necessity of returning home without seeing him. In attestation of the truth and validity of these presents, we affix our signature and the seal of our arms and office, this 6th of November, 1615. Paris. Undersigned,

---

* Episcopius' letter to Byland is to be found in the folio edition of the *Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ et Theologiæ*, p. 414, and the one to the ambassador at p. 412.

"GEDEON van den BOETSELER and ASPEREN."

This gentleman farther interested himself in this affair, as to request the minister, Du Moulin, to write to the professor, Polyander, on the subject, who was the colleague of Episcopius. This he readily did, and in his letter stated to Polyander that he understood that Episcopius had been at Charenton for the purpose of hearing him preach, but he was not aware of it till he had departed, otherwise he should certainly have made search for him after the service; and in the event of finding his residence should have waited upon him. He added, also, that he had been invited by the ambassador to dine with him, for the purpose of meeting with that professor, but that he could not comply with his excellency's request, having previously invited some friends to dine with him on the same day. And, moreover, he was informed by his excellency's chaplain that Episcopius, in company with him, had been twice at his house for the purpose of waiting upon him, but in both instances he was from home. These letters being made public, this scandalous report soon died away.*

CHAPTER VII.

In proceeding with the memoirs of Episcopius, the reader will have to remark, that it is our painful task to lay before him an exhibition of character which is by no means honourable to the parties of whom it is descriptive, especially when they are considered not merely as professors and zealous advocates of our holy religion, but persons who from their office were called upon to inculcate and exhibit in their conduct its principles and maxims. But painful as it may be to present the clerical character, in connection with some of the most revolting dispositions of the heart, such as dissimulation, envy, malevolence, and jealousy, yet the manifestation of these in the conduct of some of the leading personages of the period of which we are writing, was not only evident, but mightily contributed to produce the religious strife and animosity by which it was so painfully distinguished, that we could hardly give a perfect representation of the spirit of the age, unless we were to advert to some of the persons in whom they were most conspicuous, and whose proceedings tended to agitate Holland at the close of the sixteenth, and the beginning of the seventeenth century. That zeal for creed and confession is frequently associated with some of the worst, because malignant, passions of the heart, is a fact that the page of ecclesiastical history places beyond a doubt. And when such confessions are adopted, under a conviction of their being in accordance with truth, it is not unfrequently the case that the very interpretations of them, both in the mind of their expositors and abettors, are not merely viewed with the most perfect approbation, but convert them into the fierce defenders of a system of opinions that, in their estimation, almost bear the stamp of infallibility, and prompt them to the adoption of measures in their defence which, generated by pride, bigotry, and jealousy, lead them, though unconsciously, not merely to assume the character of despots over the thinkings of others, but generate a course of proceeding in their vindication which, in any other case, save in the defence of an admitted creed, or their own interpretations of it, would be seen as the result of vicious feelings; while in their case they are contemplated as the growth of virtue, and the offspring of religious affections. In how many instances the conduct of several of the divines of the Low Countries, and the proceedings of the Synod of Dort, were in conformity with the sentiments thus stated, the reader has, or will have, to notice from the statements contained in the following pages.

---

* Bayle, who gives a brief statement of this circumstance, shrewdly remarks, "The heads of parties, in disputes of literature and religion, do not spend money enough in maintaining spies. Not but that they are extremely curious to know whatever their adversaries say or do, but they easily believe all reports, and are too forward to confirm them with the weight of their testimonies. Zeal often makes people persuade themselves that a heretic is capable of the most infamous plots; and from this persuasion they easily pass on to another, which is, that they fancy that he actually contrives all plots of which they suppose him to be capable. As soon as they have got this into their head, they practise what the Scripture says, *From the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*, and turn their suspicions and surmises into public speeches and formal accusations."—*Art. Episcopius*, note i.

These remarks we have thought it right to make previously to our bringing before the reader the character of a person who played a most prominent part in the history of the Netherlands, at this period of religious excitement and trouble. This man was a minister at Leyden, named Festus Hommius, and from his residence near the celebrated Dutch university, was made by the bigoted Calvinistic clergy the confidant of their suspicions and jealousies as to the spread of Arminianism. And while he seemed to be sensitively alive to the honour of the confidence thus reposed in him, the temperament of his mind made him capable of performing the work of a spy upon the conduct, first of Arminius, and subsequently of Episcopius. He was cool, insinuating, artful, and treacherous; slander and detraction were aliments for which he had a voracious appetite; and while he nourished a taste for such materials, the feelings that rendered him capable of receiving them, necessarily disposed him to present them to others. In perfect accordance with the duplicity of his character, he was, as the reader will recollect, among the first to congratulate Episcopius after he had delivered his inaugural oration, on his appointment to the office of theological professor, asserting that he was highly gratified by his elevation,* because he knew him to be an amiable and peaceable man. Thus, by subtle and feigned compliments, he attempted, assassin-like, to put the victim of his base designs off his guard, that he might the more fiercely pounce upon him in the hour of confidence and security. Occasionally attending the professor's disputations, he nodded assent, and thus appeared to approve of the sentiments he advanced; but at other times, with the students who were in the practice of taking down his propositions, as they were given *vivâ voce*, he was secretly holding correspondence and obtaining imperfect notes of them, and also what passed at the disputation of them. These he treasured up for the day of exposure, when he thought he could convict Episcopius of heterodoxy. When he had succeeded in obtaining what he deemed sufficient grounds of charges, he at first retailed these in the way of surmises, to those who had set him on the dark work of a spy; and afterward proceeded to make open and avowed statements of them to one of the senators of Amsterdam, that great seat of bigotry, where Plancius, Becius, and others were always at work to injure the Remonstrants, and fan the flames of dissension and strife. This gentleman, whose name was Grotenhuis, while on a visit at Leyden, was told by Hommius that Episcopius had adopted a mode of interpreting and teaching in the university perfectly Socinian; and that in a few years the whole university would be completely Socinianized. The honourable curators being informed of this by the Heer Grotenhuis, deemed it due to themselves and the honour of the university, that the affair should be inquired into; and they accordingly sent for Episcopius to inform him of the reports that were in circulation.

---

* See page 117.

This and other parts of the conduct of Hommius made a deep impression on Episcopius, while he saw him constantly attempting to blast his fame, ruin his character, and hurl him from that eminence to which his talents and piety had raised him. During his banishment, which was chiefly effected by the exertions of this man, who was a great promoter of those measures which prepared the way for the calling of the Synod of Dort, Episcopius drew up a character of him, strongly shaded it is true, but not more so than was to be expected from a man who was suffering from the exertions of an individual whose ceaseless and malignant efforts, in conjunction with those of other persons like himself, rolled on the tide of opposition, which finally terminated in expelling him from his country, his home, his friends, and the sanctuary of his God; while the same measures that had banished him had caused the imprisonment of his brother ministers, and the ruin of thousands of families, exiled from their homes merely because they differed from this man and that assembly on some points of doctrine, now admitted, and even then by the more moderate Calvinists, as not being essential to salvation. This character Episcopius inserted in his answer to Camero's defence of his opinions, published against a letter written by the former on the subject of the freedom of the will.* The Latin editor has appended it to the conference our professor had with Hommius, before the Leyden magistrates and the curators of the university; we, however, shall translate and place it here, before giving the particulars of this conference, as being in accordance with the sentiments we have just stated.

"Those who throughout the whole period of the late dissension," says Episcopius, "were in constant communication with Festus, for the purpose of submitting to his notice, with kindly and patriotic solicitude, their plans for the promotion of charity, concord, and toleration; and who left nothing untried in attempting to turn him from strife, and win him to measures of amity and peace; and whose solicitude to accomplish their object, prompting them to watch his countenance, and mark his designs, were enabled to decipher and interpret the secret workings of his soul, are constrained universally to admit that his heart, as though incased in oak and brass, was impervious to every attempt to bring him to measures of peace, while the deceptiveness of his character placed him before them as being not only capable of, but actually versed in all the arts of Grecian fraud and deceit.* Supported by the clamour and passions of the mob, he availed himself of the power his influence with them gave him, and, reckless of the consequences, like a knight armed cap-a-pie, and surrounded by daring spirits, he wantonly trampled on the rights, the privileges, and the happiness of others. Malignant in his passions, and foul in his purposes, he, nevertheless, wished to veil the whole of his proceedings under the mask of religion, (of the genuineness of which it belongs not to us, but God to judge,) yet by his secret and impious plans he was constantly labouring to frustrate the peaceful measures and edicts of the government, and in opposition to the prayers and entreaties of every good man, he ceased not till he had succeeded in raising the standard of schism and revolt in Leyden, a city which, from its being the seat of a university, was looked upon as the north star of Holland; nor would he desist till he accomplished that which, however it yielded pleasure to him, was a source of grief to others, because it operated to bring upon our country the most heavy calamities. Though caressed by the dregs of the populace, whose passions he had excited, and whom he had enlisted on his side for the purpose of executing his base designs, yet by the virtuous, and those who most loved our country, he was looked upon with aversion and disgust. Subtle, crafty, deceptive, and Proteuslike, he could assume a thousand forms to deceive and betray. His words and acts were constantly at variance with each other, and when detected in his proceedings, and charged with deception and falsehood, he would stand remorseless and without a blush, as though his countenance were covered with the thick hide of an elephant; while his unabating perseverance in accomplishing his deeds of wrong proved him to be ὡς κρατερὴ δρῦς ἠὲ σίδηρος, unbending as oak, and impenetrable as iron. With him fidelity, truth, candour, honour, and integrity, were never to be found; and on this account he became odious to the nobles and governors of our country. The mob was his strength, because he knew how to act on their passions, and which, had he chosen, he could have easily subdued into a calm, but his virtue was not equal to the consequent sacrifice, for in so doing he would have lost his power, and his designs would have been frustrated. Such was the man whom you compliment, whose character, thus given, all but universal testimony will corroborate."*

---

* *Episcopii Opera*, vol i, p. 219.

---

* "Cui robur et æs triplex
Circum pectus erat."
"Quique dolis instructus et arte Pelasgâ."

The classical reader will recollect that the former of these passages is from *Horace*, book i, Ode iii, line 9, and the latter from the *Æneid of Virgil*, book ii, line 152, but are altered by Episcopius to accommodate them to his representation of the character of Festus Hommius.

Lest the character of this person, as given by Episcopius, should be thought to be the effect of mere passion and prejudice, we beg leave to state the following facts in justification of the representation thus made of the principles and conduct of this man:—To his care was committed the preparing of the second edition of the posthumous works of the two professors, Trelcatius junior and senior. The trust thus reposed in him he ought to have felt as binding him faithfully to give the opinions of these writers, and to state the facts as they were related by them; but instead of this, he basely altered and misrepresented them, without the slightest remark or notice, intending thereby, of course, to impose upon the unwary reader his own falsities for the statements of these departed professors. The deceptiveness, however, of this proceeding was soon discovered, when his edition of these writings was compared with the one that had been previously published; yet, when detected, we do not learn that he made any apology, or evinced the slightest degree of shame on account of this dishonourable transaction.

---

* The character of Festus, thus given by Episcopius, was occasioned by Camero's appealing to his testimony in proof of his sentiments *on the freedom of the will*, being in accordance with those of the Synod of Dort. On this occasion Camero chooses to pass a high eulogium on this man, at the expense of the Remonstrants, when Episcopius deemed it due to himself and friends to make the above statement. He considered him, and not without reason, the principal cause of their calamities; and he adds, that the Remonstrants, knowing him to be intent upon their ruin, could not acknowledge the Synod of Dort as an equitable tribunal to decide upon their cause, while he was the great promoter and director of all its measures. In adverting to the terms of complacency in which Camero speaks of Festus, Episcopius wittily remarks, "Laudaverat ille te prior; videri potes vicem ei rependere; et sane rependis non sine usurâ. Vide, Camero, ne tibi dicatur quod solet. *Mutuum muli scabunt.*" And then adds, "Si enim vir iste non interfuit modo, sed pœne præfuit synodo, jam certe is, quem capitalissimum hostem eorum fuisse constat, sedit in synodo pœne præcipuus judex ipsorum, quod unum fuit ex præcipuis illis capitibus, de quibus conquerebantur in synodo, et propter quæ se synodum causæ suæ judicem agnoscere non posse bonâ conscientiâ protestabantur: quæ certe nemo non debet fateri fuisse justissima, si inter istos pœne præcipuus sedit ac præfuit Festus Hommius."—*Episcopii Opera*, vol. i, p. 221.

In a similar way, as already stated, he treated Episcopius, by obtaining his private and public disputations, as they were copied down by the divinity students who attended them; and although he must have known that these, when taken in this manner, even by young men of the greatest acquirements, would inevitably be inaccurate, yet from such sources as these it was that he ventured to publish them, and from which, thus imperfectly given, the Synod of Dort pronounced upon his opinions, and those taught by the Remonstrants, which were considered by the members of that assembly as not being included in the five points. Nay, he went so far in his misrepresentations of Episcopius' theses, that even Bayle admits that he not only completely altered the sense of some of them, but gave them in so incorrect a manner as to make them appear as containing the most palpable contradictions. Against this disgraceful mode of proceeding Episcopius published a vindication of himself and his opinions, in a work entitled *Optima Fides Festi Hommii*, in which he gives in one column his theses as composed and delivered by himself, and then in the other those pretended to be his, as they were represented by Hommius. This was done with the design of disabusing the foreign divines who had been imposed upon by Festus' tract, which had been published for the purpose of prejudicing them against Episcopius and the Remonstrants, that they might the more readily concur in the condemnation designed to be passed upon them by Hommius and his Dutch Calvinistic clerical brethren. Can it, therefore, be matter of surprise, that our professor, when speaking of the Synod of Dort, should be unwilling to allow it to be a proper tribunal to decide upon his opinions and those of the Remonstrants, while, according to his statement already quoted, *inter istos pœne præcipuus sedit ac præfuit Festus Hommius*, and thus as a leading member and prime mover of all its proceedings, was seen to be sedulously and treacherously endeavouring to effect their ruin. And yet this was the very man to whom our James presented a piece of plate for the measures he adopted to accomplish such an object. This conduct was, however, fearfully visited upon his successor, when the spirit that animated such a man as Festus gave directions to the ruling party in England.*

---

* Another of these worthies, who played a prominent part at this synod, was Sibrandus, whose name has already made a conspicuous appearance in these pages, as disputing with, and being vanquished by, Episcopius. We are aware that an apology is due to the reader for the introduction of his name here, but it is hoped that the following statement will be received as such:—

We have recently been indebted to Mr. Nichols for the loan of several Dutch publications, presented to him by different Remonstrant ministers, who had obtained copies of his translation of Arminius' works. Of these we intend to make a liberal use in the following pages. One of them bears the following title, *Lofreden op Simon Episcopius*, or, *A Panegyric on the Character of Simon Episcopius.* This was delivered in Latin by John Konijnenburgh, in the Remonstrant church at Amsterdam on the 23d of November, 1790, on his induction into the office of Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History, at the seminary of the Remonstrants; and subsequently translated by him and published in Dutch, and which contains the following note, explanatory of the conduct of Sibrandus toward Episcopius, as mentioned in these memoirs at page 71, commencing at the 11th line. Sibrandus, mortified at the success of Episcopius and his own discomfiture, devised the following measures to ruin him :—Secretly calling together three or four of the students in whom he could confide, he unfolded his nefarious purpose to them, which was as follows: they were to invite him, with apparent friendship, to sup with them, and, if possible, to make him drunk; and, in the event of succeeding, were to sally out and break the windows of the neighbouring houses, and by other riotous means create a row. The captain of the night watch, who was also let into the secret, was requested to seize only upon Episcopius, and

We shall now give a few extracts from the conference alluded to, which, in connection with other statements to be presented to the reader, while they may dispose him to admit the correctness of the portraiture thus drawn of Hommius, will likewise serve to show on what grounds he, and those who acted with him, charged Arminius, Episcopius, his brother ministers, and through them the Remonstrants, at the Synod of Dort, with Socinianism.

Episcopius being summoned by the magistrates and curators to appear before them, they informed him, "that it had been stated to them by a most respectable gentleman, that he had recently introduced some novel and singular doctrines into the university, during the discussion of one of his theses; and that his manner of instruction bore a striking resemblance to that adopted by the Soci-

---

conduct him before the magistrates, as a drunken student and disturber of the peace of the city. This being done, Sibrandus, as one of the heads of the university, was to propose his expulsion from the college, and in this way disqualify him from entering the ministry. Happily for Episcopius, his apprehensions of these young men having some evil design upon him were soon excited, by the manner in which they showed their solicitude to fill his glass; and rising from the table as if to retire but for a few minutes, and leaving his cloak behind, to prevent all suspicion of his intention not to return, he escaped, and instantly made his way to his lodgings. In this manner he frustrated the infernal machinations of this professor. Some years after, the captain of the night watch, who was thus let into the secret, and was called upon to play his part in this infamous transaction, had a son who was a student under Sibrandus, whom the latter treated with great injustice. The father, in the way of retribution, exposed the whole affair, and in this way it was made known even to Episcopius himself sometime after. This account Limborch, for some reasons best known to himself, did not choose to insert in his memoirs of Episcopius, though he had previously stated it in a letter, written in Latin, to a certain learned Englishman, named Oliver Doiley, member of King's College, bearing date April 20, 1684, and from which, says Konijnenburgh, we have taken the above statement.

In holding up such men as Hommius and Sibrandus to public reprobation, as prime actors at the Synod of Dort, we do not intend to identify with them, and their conduct, the whole of the members of that assembly. Many of the foreign divines were amiable, pious men, and merely attended there at the dictate of their sovereigns, who, in assisting by their proxies to procure the condemnation of the Remonstrants, secretly sought to serve some political purpose of their own, while they publicly appeared only to be serving Prince Maurice.

nians, and that it was easy to be gathered from the mode of his treating the above thesis, that he did not believe in the resurrection of the dead." To these charges the professor replied, "that he was not aware that he had introduced novelties into the college; and as to his adopting a Socinian mode of teaching, he denied it in toto; while as to the third—that of his not believing in the resurrection of the body—he said it was so gross and foul a calumny that he thought it could not be believed by any reasonable person, much less by any truly religious man. Nevertheless, he said, as his lectures were open to the public, and were frequently attended by several of the clergy, from whence it is probable these charges have originated, it would at once be the better way to send for the person who dared to make them, in order that he might confront him, and answer them before their honours." The burgomasters and curators, seeing Episcopius so solicitous to meet his accuser, thought it due to him that the person should be sent for who had made these statements to the senator, Grotenhuis, and knowing the busy and meddling disposition of Hommius, they suspected that the affair originated with him, and immediately agreed to send for him; and when he arrived they asked him, "if he had said to the Heer Grotenhuis, that Episcopius, while discussing his thesis on *De convenientiâ et discrimine Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*, had made use of terms which showed that he who adopted them might justly be suspected of Socinianism, and that in a little time the university would be completely Socinianized?" The subject being brought before Hommius in this form, he found it impossible to evade giving something like a direct answer, and said, "that he certainly had made a declaration to that effect," but added, at the same time, in character with himself, "that he had assured that gentleman that he was perfectly satisfied with the disputation itself." The curators and burgomasters, however, declared, "that the above statement was unaccompanied with any such qualifying remarks." But as Festus still protested in asserting this to be the case, these gentlemen, of course, had too much respect for the clerical profession to say they believed the contrary. He was then introduced into the presence of Episcopius, to whom it was said by Vander Myle, "that

Festus Hommius had made certain declarations relative to the instructions he gave in the university, which, if true, would be injurious to his reputation; and they had therefore sent for him to make his own statements of the case to Episcopius himself." Festus, thus situated, found there was no way of escape, and accordingly repeated so much, and in the form he thought proper, of the conversation he had had with the senator, Grotenhuis; stating, "that he certainly did understand Episcopius to intimate that no other result was to arise from the resurrection of Christ beyond that of its furnishing us with motives to forsake sin and seek holiness: and, moreover, he was inclined to believe that his mode of teaching was perfectly novel in the university, and dissimilar to that generally used by our doctors, and approached to the method adopted by the Socinians." To these charges Episcopius replied, "that he wished Festus, when he had noticed any thing in his theses or disputations which he thought to be wrong, had named his objections to him before he mentioned them to persons who, from the eminence of their station, might, by giving publicity to them, greatly injure his character at Amsterdam, and likewise destroy his ministerial usefulness in other places. Charity," he said, "demanded that thus he ought to have acted; while the prudence of such a mode of proceeding must be obvious, inasmuch as it was possible, that in an interview with him he might have explained what appeared objectionable, so as to have removed all his scruples; but since Festus had not chosen to act so honourable and Christian a part, he should proceed to meet the charges he alleged against him.

"As to the ninth thesis, in which he treated of the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ, he was utterly surprised that any one should infer from it that he did not believe in the resurrection of the body; the more especially as he had, during the discussion of it, distinctly stated that one of the most powerful motives by which we could be prompted to live a holy and devoted life, was that which might be derived from the fact, that all the members of Christ's body, which is the Church, should finally be united to him, and raised, through his power, from death to eternal life. And he would put it to Festus himself to say, whether he thought it possible to present a more powerful argument to induce a person to consecrate himself to God and Christian truth, than the one thus deducible from this subject." To this he replied, "he believed there was not; nevertheless," he added, "that he did understand Episcopius as intending to intimate that no other effect would arise from the resurrection of Christ beyond that of its exciting us to forsake sin and seek holiness." Episcopius here expressed his surprise at this statement, and said, "that he did not see how it was possible that his words could be understood as conveying such a meaning, much less that it could be supposed that he held such a doctrine."* Festus then said, "Gentlemen, I am satisfied with this declaration of the professor," adding, just like himself, "that he indeed was not offended with the thesis, but his kinsman, Herman Kucklinus."

Episcopius then proceeded to the next charge, that of his having introduced novelties into the university; which he denied on the ground of his thesis being copied nearly verbatim from the works of Arminius, who was formerly professor in this university, and had there taught the sentiments which he had advanced. To this Festus replied, "that it was no proof that his theses were not novel or heterodox, because they were either taken from or founded on the writings of Arminius, inasmuch as there were several things in them, which, in his opinion, were not only questionable, but induced him as well as others to suspect him of heterodoxy." To which the professor made answer, "that he should hesitate before he admitted that Festus could point out any thing in the writings of Arminius that could fairly be charged with heterodoxy, and for the following reason, that he and his friends had already spared no pains in examining his works, and more than once had pointed out what they supposed to be heterodox, for the purpose of fixing a stigma upon his memory, and through him assailing the Remonstrants; and therefore if any thing more could be detected as erroneous in them, it would have been done long since, and made known to the public." This Festus denied by saying, "that the reason why he and his friends did not proceed farther in pointing out what was censurable in the works of Arminius originated with himself, in consequence of his having suggested that it was necessary that one side should show an example of moderation and forbearance, or they could have detected much more that was defective and reprehensible than what had already been pointed out." This self-applause was too much for Episcopius to bear, and he instantly exclaimed, "What, sir, you show moderation and forbearance! I am astonished to hear you talk thus; pray were not you the person who, in direct opposition to the orders of the States, published the Delft conference, with certain remarks on the sentiments of those who took part in it; inserting therein, likewise, what you supposed to be the opinions of other persons whom you chose to suspect as holding sentiments beyond those expressed in the five points, and in which you especially named Arminius, Borrhius, and Corvinus?" This was rather an awkward question; first, because the statement it contained was true; and secondly, it adverted in the presence of these magistrates to an act which was done by him, in direct opposition to the declared commands of his superiors and governors; and to add to his embarrassing situation, the syndic, following out the question of Episcopius, said to Festus, "Sir, you well know that the publication of that conference was prohibited by the States." This would have confounded any other person than Hommius; but he was not the man to flounder in such a case, either through excessive modesty, or a want of resources in devising the means of escape; and therefore, pretending to understand him as alluding to the Enchusan edition, he said, "that he did not know how it had been published;" but Episcopius, not willing to allow him to escape by this answer, said, "Sir, the syndic does not allude to the Enchusan edition, but to the publishing of the conference itself, which was done in the first instance by you."* To this Festus made no answer, but like a good tactician instantly turned the attention of the gentlemen to another subject, by addressing Episcopius, and saying, "that in the writings of Ar-

---

* And yet it appears that such an opinion had been spread among the people, since we find that Popius, a Remonstrant minister, says, in his preface to a work called *De Enge Porte*, or, *The Strait Gate*, which consists of certain sermons published by him, and highly spoken of by Episcopius and Grotius, "that those who will read them will see how the Remonstrants have been unjustly and falsely charged with denying the resurrection of the dead. We, on the contrary," he adds, "preach true holiness, and hope for a resurrection and life everlasting."—*Brandt*, vol. ii, p. 26. *Historie der Remonstranten, door Jacobus Regenboog Eerste, deel bl.* 158.

---

* It may here be necessary to inform the reader that the Delft conference, held between three Remonstrant and three Contra-Remonstrant ministers, like that of the Hague, was appointed by the magistrates, with the hope that the opposite parties might, by mutual explanations and concessions, be disposed to treat each other as brethren, and live in peace and charity. But it failed to effect so desirable an object. The Remonstrants lay the blame on their opponents, while the latter, though not charging the former with want of readiness to show forbearance, yet assert that they discovered that the Remonstrants cherished such dark and awful errors, that to come to terms of amity and toleration with them, while they were unwilling to give them up, was utterly impossible. Hence this conference, instead of helping, injured the Remonstrants. This arose partly from the magistrates prohibiting the publication of what might pass on the occasion, which threw a dark and mysterious character over its proceedings, and left the excited imaginations of the people to supply by fiction that of which their understandings were ignorant. Festus took advantage of this circumstance, and whispered strange things; intimating that the Remonstrants had secret designs which they were unwilling to disclose; which so wrought upon the people that they were excited to a state of feeling almost amounting to maniac frenzy. In Holland, at this period, the word *heterodoxy* acted like a dark spell, and religious controversy became the all-absorbing theme; and the very genius of the Dutch nation seemed to be changed for a while; and this cold phlegmatic people, usually intent upon nothing so much as driving a hard bargain, actually felt that the clearing up of certain doubtful points in metaphysical theology was of more importance than the every-day business of life. The pulpit and the palace, the market and the 'change, the wagons and boats, presented a constant arena of contention; and the prince and peasant, the statesman and soldier, were actually carried away by the mania, and entered the lists as disputants, intent upon settling the questions in debate between the followers of Arminius and Calvin; while private and domestic associations became one scene of strife and debate, in which all the fierce passions of the soul were seen to be in motion. Amidst these commotions, and in his element, lived Festus, as the fostering and ruling spirit of the tempest and the storm.

In the commencement of this conference, Festus suggested that nothing should be committed to writing of what passed; and yet, when they were about to separate, he proposed that each party should note down what had been advanced on each side. The Remonstrants thought this strange, but consented, and drew up what they had maintained, especially inserting in their document a request they had before urged, for the toleration of the five points, and to which the other party would not consent during the conferminius he had discovered what to him were several very doubtful points. For though it is true," he said, "when he heard the orations of Arminius, he was not then struck with them as containing any thing that was reprehensible, yet since that time he had seen reason to suspect several of the statements they contained." Episcopius then requested him to point out what he considered erroneous in them, beyond what belonged to the five points; when Festus said, "that in the one which treated of the *object of theology* he disapproved of the statement which declared that the object of theology is God and Christ; which," said he, "is precisely what is asserted by the Socinians. It is true," he added, "I am aware that some of our theologians have made use of the same mode of stating the subject." To this the professor replied, "that he was utterly surprised to hear Festus demur at this mode of exhibiting the object of theology, and at his daring to infer from thence that because it was so done by Arminius, it was therefore erroneous, when he not only admitted that it was thus represented by doctors of his own school; but above all, he ought to recollect that it is so expressed by Jesus Christ himself in those well known and memorable words, *This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* (John xvii, 3.) And if objections are to be made against those who have thus stated this subject, and they are to be suspected of Socinianism, pray who of our doctors would be free from the liability to such a charge? If, indeed, in thus presenting the subject, it was so expressed that a distinction was made between the Father and the Son, as to imply that Christ was not essentially

ence. This being done, the Contra-Remonstrants, instead of acting upon their own proposal, and presenting in writing the statements they had made, produced a paper containing thirty-two questions, which they had artfully prepared, it is thought, before the meeting, as a snare for the Remonstrants, insisting that they should declare their approval of its contents. They well knew that this would not be done; but it answered their purpose by enabling them to throw the blame of the failure of the conference upon them; and likewise gave a colouring to their false statements, in which they charged them with cherishing secret and dark errors, which they dare not openly avow; alleging, in proof of this assertion, that if they had nothing to conceal they could not refuse signing such a document. See *Brandt.*

equal with the Father, then there would be ground for suspicion; but when the distinction is thus made, solely in reference to Christ as a Mediator between God and man, it is perfectly groundless." "I am quite aware," said Festus, "that such a statement may be understood in a sound sense, but it is equally possible for it to veil a double and doubtful meaning; and in the case of Arminius it is the more so, when it is considered that in his oration *De certitudine Theologiæ*, all those Scripture places in which our doctors and theologians affirm that the Divine nature of Christ, and his *ομουσια*, or *consubstantiality* with the Father, are spoken of, are explained by him in a way different from them; as, for instance, in the passage in *Hebrews* i, 3, in which Christ is designated *the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person*, Arminius interprets it, as implying that Jesus Christ is called the likeness of God *and the express image of his person*, in relation to us, inasmuch as in and through him are expressed and exhibited to us all the Divine attributes, as wisdom, power, goodness, &c."* Episcopius replied by saying, "that Festus had stated the subject unfairly, by insinuating that because Arminius had interpreted some of those passages generally adduced in proof of the Divinity of Christ in a way different to some of our theologians, he had therefore done so with all the passages supposed to bear on this subject. And why, he would ask, should an individual be suspected of heterodoxy, upon any one article of the Christian faith, on account of his differently interpreting a few obscure passages supposed to refer to it, when it is known that he admits the common and orthodox interpretations of others, the greater number of which are allowed to state the doctrine more distinctly. Besides, he said Arminius had fully declared his opinions on this subject, in his thesis on the *Father and the Son*,* and in justice to him a reference should be made to that for his opinions, and not to his interpretation of isolated or obscure passages, in which he had chosen to claim and act upon the right of private judgment, a right always recognized in the Church, and of which none had made a more liberal use than Calvin himself, who had taken the liberty of expressing his opinion on a very large number of passages, some of which relate to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son, in a way very different from those of the fathers, and what is more in point, he has actually interpreted the above passage in the same way that Arminius has done. Now, with this fact before your honours, I shall leave you to determine, with what justice Festus will allow Calvin to be sound in his views on this text, and Arminius to be considered as a Socinian, or why the same interpretation is to be understood as being *orthodox* in the former, but *heterodox* in the latter?" The curators felt the force of this remark, and instantly expressed their assent to the correctness of the sentiments it conveyed.

---

* This interpretation, as given by Arminius, and objected to by Festus, is almost literally the same as that subsequently adopted by John Owen, on this very passage; and we think it right to present it to the reader to prove that while the latter is admitted as orthodox on the Trinity, the former had never been supposed to be heterodox on it, had he believed election and reprobation, as Festus did.

"By *character* two things seem to be intended. 1. That the Son himself is *εν μορφη Θεου, in the likeness of God*, Phil. ii, 6. 2. That unto us the Son is *εικων Θεου, the image of God*, representing him unto us, Col. i, 15."

"In the manifestation of God unto us he is said to be *εικων του Θεου του αορατου, the image of the invisible God*, because in him, so partaker of the nature of the Father, do the power, goodness, holiness, grace, and all other glorious properties of God shine forth, being in him represented unto us, 2 Cor. iv, 6. And both these seem to be comprised in this word *χαρακτηρ*, both that the whole nature of God is in him, as also that by him God is declared and expressed unto us."

"The words, as was showed before, denote the Divine nature of Christ, yet not absolutely, but as God the Father in him doth manifest himself unto us."

---

* This thesis may be found in Mr. Nichols' translation of Arminius' works, vol. ii, p. 137, where the reader will meet with the following passages:—

Speaking of the Father, he says, "He is the first person in the sacred Trinity, who from all eternity of himself begat his Word, which is his Son, by communicating to him his own Divinity."

"We attribute to Him 'active generation,' which is likewise comprised under the word 'Father,' but of its mode and *ratio* we willingly confess ourselves to be ignorant."

"We have hitherto treated of the FATHER.—The Son is the second person in the holy Trinity, the Word of the Father, begotten of the Father from all eternity, and [*egressus*] proceeding from him by the communication of the same Deity which the Father possesses without origination."

"From these positions we perceive that an agreement and a distinction subsist between the Father and the Son. (1) AN AGREEMENT in reference to one and the same nature and essence, according to which the Son is said to be 'in the form of God,' and 'equal with the Father,' (Phil. ii, 6;) and, according to the decree of the Nicene Council, to be *ομουσιος*, ('of the same substance,') 'consubstantial with the Father,' not *ομοιυσιος* 'of like substance;' because the comparison of things in essence must be referred not to *similitude* or *dissimilitude*, but to EQUALITY OR INEQUALITY, according to the very nature of things and of truth itself."

Festus, then addressing himself to Episcopius, said, "But, sir, you will not attempt to affirm that in your lectures in the college you do not interpret almost all the passages of Scripture you discuss, according to the mode adopted by the Socinians?" Fired by this question, Episcopius said, "Sir, I am utterly surprised to hear this accusation from you, seeing that you have but once honoured me with your presence at my lectures since I have been in the professor's chair." "But I have heard your disputations," replied Festus. "Well, sir, and on these occasions did you ever hear me advance any thing which was in direct opposition to the received opinions of the Church? And have you not, on the contrary, heard me directly oppose those who maintain the opinions of Socinus? Nay, and I understand that you yourself, after attending one of my disputations, said to Borrhius that I had bravely and learnedly defended the Divinity of Christ, in opposition to those who denied it." "Not so," replied Festus; "it was not in relation to the Divinity of Christ that I said this, but of your views of the Trinity. I said I did not expect you thus so nobly and openly to declare your mind upon it as you then did." "Well, sir," it was replied, "and in thus defending the doctrine of the Trinity, did I not at the same time defend that of the Divinity of the Son? for in maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity, I by consequence maintained that of the Godhead of Christ, these being correlative." Here Festus saw himself overtaken, and to attempt an escape by denying the inference from his own admission was out of the question; and therefore he was determined to make his retreat by the use of a faculty which usually served him more successfully than his reasoning powers; that is, his capability of duplicity; and turning around to the curators, with a significant smile, designed to produce its full effect, he said, "Gentlemen, I assent; and by this you see how honest and sincere I am; for when satisfaction is given to me, I am most willing and ready to acknowledge it."

Driven from his point of substantiating his charge of Socinianism against Episcopius, in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity, and yet wishing to avoid the appearance of being a common slanderer, in wantonly and unwarrantably charging him with it, and that without evidence, he shifted his ground, by saying "that his suspicions of the professor being disposed to the opinions of Socinus, were principally excited by what he had advanced when attempting to show the harmony and disagreement of the Old and New Testaments, he having asserted that under the New Testament the promises were different from those under the old." "True, sir," said Episcopius, "but this relates to the manner, not the matter of these promises." "But did you not say that the Gospel is supported by better promises?" "I did, sir, and I say so now, for two reasons: first, because this is the language of the New Testament, and secondly, because such is the fact: but they are better, not because they are different as to the subjects of promise, but because they are more clear and distinct in their exhibition of those subjects, and among others the promise of eternal life may be instanced. Under the Old Testament, the promises were veiled and clothed in shadows, and expressed in general terms; under the New Testament, they are open, clear, and distinct, and the whole of my remarks went simply to establish this point." "I grant," said Festus, "as the subject is now stated, it is orthodox; nevertheless, the very language of your thesis is suspicious, for in it you say, 'that the types and shadows were not understood by all believers under the Old Testament, but that only some few of the prophets knew them to be types of things which have been since revealed in the New Testament.'" To convince Festus of his mistake on this point, the professor, without making any reply, instantly read the thesis itself, which stated just the contrary, and ran thus: "That *all* the faithful who were under the Old Testament had, indeed, some knowledge of the types and shadows, but that it was obscure and limited, arising from the obscurity of their dispensation; but that the prophets and some of the fathers, had clear and distinct perceptions of them."* He then asked Festus whether he would venture to assert that all the faithful of the Old Testament had clear notions of the types and shadows. "Not clear," he replied, "in comparison with ours." "That is," said Episcopius, "to admit that they have a dark and we a clear knowledge of them." In this statement the curators concurred, and were determined to close the business, and therefore said that the parties were of the same opinion. Here Festus wished to fly off to matters foreign to the subject before them, but they forbade his so doing, saying they had heard sufficient to satisfy them on the affair, and it was their judgment that Festus should acquaint the Heer Grotenhuis himself, if he were in town, that the professor, Episcopius, had given him perfect satisfaction, in relation to certain objections that had existed in his mind in reference to the late thesis; and if this gentleman had left the town, he should then state the same in a letter to him. Festus seemed very reluctant to comply with this request, and by various subterfuges wished to evade compliance with the expressed wish of the curators, saying, among other things, "Gentlemen, it is really quite unnecessary, as I have done so already." Episcopius, however, knowing what all these declarations were worth, concurred in the wish expressed by the curators, that Festus should make the above statement to the Heer Grotenhuis, which the curators urging upon him, he promised to do. But though he had so done, Episcopius knew him too well to confide in what he said; and aware that there was neither truth nor honour about him, and that his engagement, if actually fulfilled, would be no security to him against his disposition to slander and misrepresent him, he therefore, for his own defence against the scurrilous tongue of Festus, asked the curators and burgomasters to grant him a written certificate of what had passed, that he might produce it when circumstances rendered it necessary for him so to do.

---

* "Such was the poverty of the types, that no one of them could so much as shadow out, or represent, all that advantage which we really enjoy."—*Owen on the Hebrews*, vol. iii, p. 535. Our Calvinistic friends must admit that Episcopius is here in very good company.

These gentlemen complied with his wishes, and presented him with the following testimonial:—

"The curators of the university, and the burgomasters of the city of Leyden, having understood that Festus Hommius, a minister of this city, had stated to the Heer Jan ten Grotenhuis, schepen of the city of Amsterdam, that in the thesis *De convenientiâ et discrimine veteris et novi testamenti*, at which Dr. Simon Episcopius, professor of theology in the aforesaid university, presided on the 7th of May last, there were some phrases used, and a mode of expression adopted, which had induced some to believe that the authors and defenders of them leaned toward Socinianism; and the curators believing that they were bound, as well for the vindication of the honour and reputation of the university as that of their own, to investigate the ground of these charges, in order that the aforesaid university might remain free from blame, deemed it right to summon the said Episcopius and Festus Hommius to appear before them, that they might ascertain from them the particulars of this matter; and after some discourse and conference upon the subject, Festus declared that he had conceived some suspicion in relation to the above thesis, but in the disputation at which Episcopius presided, he had given him satisfaction; which he declared he had stated to the Heer Jan ten Grotenhuis, and that since then he had become more fully satisfied. The said curators and burgomasters, having heard Festus aver the same in their presence, desired the said Festus, that since he was satisfied with the declarations of Episcopius, he would write to the said Heer Grotenhuis, and entreat him also to dismiss any suspicions that he might have cherished on the subject. With this request Festus promised compliance, and Episcopius having asked for a certificate of the same, the curators and burgomasters have ordered these presents to be delivered to him for his use, as the necessity of circumstances may require.

"Signed by the aforesaid curators and burgomasters this 10th day of May, 1616.

"By order of the curators and burgomasters,

"NICHOLAS VAN ZEYST."

How far the professor was correct in his conjectures of Festus giving a wrong statement of the termination of this interview, and the wisdom of his requesting the above document in the way of self-defence, facts soon proved. For not many days had elapsed, before it was rumoured abroad, to his great injury, that in his conference with Festus, in the presence of the curators and burgomasters, he had been clearly convicted of Socinianism, and treated very roughly: and that he was especially cautioned not to introduce into the university doctrines calculated to seduce the students into error, otherwise he must be prepared to take the consequences. These reports, which were traced up to Festus, were not only believed by some of the members of the Church at Leyden, but were likewise spread through the country by Flemings and Walloons, as they travelled in boats or wagons, to the very great injury of the professor's character, and produced no small excitement among the people. Now, though Episcopius was fully aware that all he could do or say, would not prevent this man from defaming his character, and misrepresenting his opinions; nevertheless he deemed it proper to show his readiness to gainsay these reports, and appealed to the curators of the university and the magistrates of the city to be heard in his defence against these farther charges. These gentlemen having complied with his request, he accordingly waited upon them on the 8th of August for that purpose; when Festus, being again sent for, was informed by the pensionary of the city, of the object for which he had been summoned before them. Episcopius and Festus then entered into a long conference upon the above charges, the recital of which we, with Limborch, think would be uninteresting to the reader, and for that reason shall omit it, as he has done in the Dutch copy of the memoirs, with the exception of some of the more prominent parts of it. The Latin editor, however, deemed it proper to give a lengthened account of it, assigning, as his reason for so doing, that Triglandius, a Contra-Remonstrant, had pretended to give this conference in his Ecclesiastical History, but instead of which he had most grossly misrepresented the whole affair; and did not scruple to assert that Festus had convicted Episcopius, on the occasion, of Socinianism; a fact which he affirmed the curators themselves had fully admitted.

Although we thus deem it proper not to insert this conference in our pages, which amounted almost to a dispute about words and terms, used by Episcopius in his thesis, which Festus thought to be erroneous, and capable of receiving a double meaning; yet we think it right to say that the curators sent for Festus the next day, and in a friendly manner said to him that they had understood, from what he had intimated yesterday, that he certainly could make it appear in writing that Episcopius was in the practice of teaching Socinian doctrines; and as they did not wish to prevent him from so doing, they would certainly examine any production that he might present to them to that effect. But when pressed to engage in such a task he hesitated, saying that the continued illness of his wife, with other affairs, had and would prevent it, otherwise he was fully persuaded that he could do it. The curators, understanding these excuses as mere subterfuges to escape from his vain threat, then had recourse to the most conciliatory means, in order to dispose him to measures of peace and amity, using every argument they thought likely to act upon him; and by appealing to him as a patriot, a citizen, a Christian, and a minister, endeavoured to induce him to live in concord with his brother ministers who differed from him in religious opinions, and thus strive to promote the well-being of the State and the Church. But all efforts of this kind were lost upon Festus. Discord and strife were the scenes in which he took pleasure; and to cherish the elements of them seemed most congenial to his spirit, and therefore, despite of all entreaties, he soon rumoured it abroad that he had fully made it out before the curators that Episcopius was secretly and at heart a Socinian. He also had the temerity to insinuate, in opposition to all truth, that he believed the pensionary, Zeyst, was of the same opinion.

In forming an estimate of the character of this man, whose proceedings were attended with such fatal results, occasioned by his exciting jealousy and alarm in the minds of the Dutch ministers and magistrates, relative to the growth of error in the principal seat of learning, we were at first stunned and confounded, and felt it difficult, while following him through all his dark and tortuous proceedings, to allow any thing like justice, truth, or goodness to be found in him; and were instinctively led to view him with unmixed displeasure and reprobation, as a person whose actings seemed only to exhibit the vices of a depraved heart in their darkest forms. Reluctant, however, to allow these impressions to have a permanent hold on our minds, we are anxious, if possible, to contemplate his conduct in connection with certain circumstances which may present his character in a somewhat less disreputable point of light, and therefore suppose him to have adopted a class of opinions generally received, and usually identified by his party with certain terms, which led him to conclude that when a different mode of expression in exhibiting them was employed by others, it veiled a latent heresy, which, being undefined, because unexpressed, a wider scope was allowed to his imagination to invest it with all the forms which jealousy and bigotry could suggest. That Festus acted under the influence of this disingenuous mode of judging, in his second conference with Episcopius, fully appears; inasmuch as he constantly laboured to make it appear that the *words* and *thoughts* of the professor were at *perfect variance*, and carried this dishonourable practice to such an extent that his conduct so disgusted one of the curators, that he exclaimed, "Sir, you are determined to understand the man otherwise than he understands himself:" when it was also added by the Heer Dyke, burgomaster of Leyden, "If the words of heretics were twisted and distorted after this manner in ancient times, one should begin to doubt whether all was true which has been said of them." And yet we are disposed to believe that in consequence of his viewing the statements of the professor as capable of a double signification, he wound himself up to the belief that his unexpressed opinion was heretical, and jumped to the conclusion that it was Socinian, and consequently that he was warranted in publicly and unblushingly denouncing him as such. Unjustifiable as such a mode of proceeding was, we choose to admit something like this to have been the case with Festus, rather than charge him with willingly and wittingly uttering what he believed at the time to be a gross falsehood.*

---

* It ought, however, here to be remarked, that some of the Contra-Remonstrant writers of that day speak of Festus in very strong terms of approval, asserting, that by his prudence and constancy

How far we are justified in believing such to have been his mode of reasoning and concluding with respect to Episcopius, we think the conduct of other Contra-Remonstrant ministers at the time will show, who did not scruple to say, when judging of the declared sentiments of the Remonstrants, "*Post singulas controversias, præruptos errores et hæreses nefandas abscondi; sub phrasibus singulis, veluti sub saxis, serpentes latere.*"* Once let such a disingenuous mode of construing the words of an opponent be adopted by polemics, and then the most trivial departures from their own modes of expression, even on minor points, will assume a character in their thinkings all important, from their supposed connection with what is momentous; and, in such a case, jealousy being awake, will become identified with holy zeal for religious truth; while the excited and perturbated feelings of the heart will render their subject incapable of distinguishing between legitimate excitement and irascible passion; and the latter, veiled under the shade of zeal for orthodoxy, will prepare the way for vice to change place with virtue, and passion with piety.

The subject, contemplated in this light, will bring the character of Festus Hommius before us with mitigating circumstances, which would otherwise stand out to our view shaded with the deepest and darkest colouring; and may equally explain the conduct of his coadjutors in their relentless proceedings, which ended in the banishment or imprisonment of their brother ministers, whose fathers, in common with their own, had cheerfully and courageously laid down their lives in resisting papal and Spanish domi-

---

he made a noble stand for the truth against the terrible attacks of the Remonstrants in these difficult and troublesome times. And certainly, if prudence is to be understood as synonymous with craft, and constancy with obstinacy in accomplishing its purpose, without a reference to the character of the means and the nature of the results, he well deserved the encomiums they passed upon him. But with all his prudence and cunning, his deceptiveness was frequently detected and exhibited to public view by the opposite party, and censured in no measured terms of reprobation; on which Brandt remarks, that however just their condemnation of his conduct might be, it is thought it only served the more to goad him on in his designs of attempting to accomplish their ruin.

* Oratio habita ab Episcopio in Synodo Nationali Dordracenâ.—*Episcopii Opera*, vol. ii, part 2, p. 21.

nation, to secure to their children that which was denied to themselves, LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

But so it was, and the suspending of the eloquent Uitenbogaerdt from his office as a minister—the banishment of the talented Episcopius from his country—the immuring the learned Grotius in a dungeon—and the beheading of the virtuous patriot and statesman, Barneveldt, under the charge of *presuming to disturb the state of religion*, are events which, while they stand the reproach of the Dutch people of the seventeenth century, alike prove that no subject can furnish equal occasion of keen resentment to the spirit with that of religious controversy: and that under such circumstances there is a readiness in the mind to give to that which is trivial all the weight of what is substantial; and that it imparts a vehemence to the feelings, while mind is contending with mind, of which no other species of strife furnishes a parallel; and, according to the statement of a popular modern writer,* "common hatred rises into an immortal abhorrence, and wrath swells to execration, and every wish breaks out in anathemas."

CHAPTER VIII.

ONE of the circumstances which gives a painful interest to the religious controversies of the Low Countries, is the evidence they afford of the blighting effects of theological strife upon the kind and social feelings of men, who otherwise were capable of living in the cultivation of the amity and friendship of private life. In no instance does this appear more evident than in the case of Polyander, the colleague of Episcopius. Whatever asperity was found in his conduct toward him, we think it must be attributed to the influence of circumstances rather than to any thing naturally malevolent and bitter in his constitution. Fully apprized of the talents and scholarship of Episcopius, he could but feel, in the first instance, that when he was named as a suitable person to rank with himself as divinity professor, before he was thirty years of age, it was either paying extraordinary homage to his talents, or else it was indicative of the strength of the party to which he was opposed. In either case he saw himself, by such a selection, thrown into the shade; and, when informed that Episcopius was to be appointed to this high office, he exhibited signs of deep mortification, which subsequently, in moments of excitement, he manifested in the greatest degree.

---

* See "FANATICISM," by the author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm.*

Apprehending the situation of his colleague, Episcopius evinced great solicitude to meet his feelings, and, as his junior, stated to him, in a conversation that Limborch gives, his most perfect readiness to adopt any measure that might tend to promote the welfare of the university, and secure to it the high consideration it had acquired. And when Polyander, in return, suggested that they should not introduce the disputed points, Episcopius perfectly complied with the proposal, saying, at the same time, that he should be most happy to take his counsel upon any matter of importance, that they might not only apparently, but really, act together, with the most perfect cordiality and friendship. Polyander, pleased with this frankness, intimated that it was the more necessary they should do so, lest, if any thing should be known to the contrary, their college might suffer from that of Groningen, in consequence of Gomarus residing there.

On this occasion Polyander likewise said to Episcopius that he had always spoken of him to the curators of the university, and to other persons, in the most respectful manner. This circumstance, however, though designed to show his friendship toward him, nevertheless indicates that it was not very ardent or evident when he found it necessary, in order to prove it, to have recourse to such a statement. Genuine and cordial friendship needs not adopt such means in order to evince its reality, inasmuch as occasions will constantly occur, in the interchange of kindly and reciprocal feeling, to place the proofs of its existence on higher ground than that to which he here adverted. The most, then, that can be said in favour of his friendship toward Episcopius is, that it merely went so far as to induce him to attend to the courtesies of polite and gentlemanly behaviour, which, as a person of education, he would be prompted to show toward another of similar rank and profession. The correctness of this statement will appear from the fact, related by Limborch, that, amid all his pretensions to kindly feeling toward him, he so far forgot himself as to speak of him, when absent, in a disrespectful manner. And on one occasion, when invited by Episcopius, Heinsius, Jaccheus, and some other gentlemen, to sup at the house of a friend, he behaved toward him in an extremely rude manner. The circumstance which occasioned his thus treating him was as follows:—It being Whitsuntide, the company were speaking of the unity existing among the disciples of our Lord, as stated in the Acts of the Apostles, when the Spirit descended upon them; which farther led to a conversation, between Heinsius and Episcopius, on the Reformation as effected by Luther, with the probable causes tending to promote it, and to give so extended a spread to his doctrines. Episcopius said, "that he thought the inflexible determination of the pope and his adherents not to bend or give way in the most trifling point, together with the outrageous conduct of those who were interested to procure the condemnation of his theses, might be considered as greatly contributing to it." On hearing this, Polyander expressed his disapprobation, first in an under tone, and afterward, more than once, said aloud, "They who here wish changes, are *rascals* and *villains*." Episcopius suffered this to pass unheeded; and was proceeding with his remarks to Heinsius,* when Polyander, with greater vehemence, uttered the same offensive language. Still he remained undisturbed, and continued his conversation with Heinsius. At this moment Jaccheus interrupted them by saying to Heinsius, "I wish you would answer me this question, Whether is it better to have peace in the State with falsehood, or excitement with truth?" "That is another matter," said Heinsius: when Polyander immediately added, "What has that to do with the subject? I say that those who seek to change the principles of the Reformation are a set of *rogues* and *thieves*." Episcopius could restrain himself no longer, and said, "Well, mister colleague, you have uttered language several times which I conceive to be very offensive and injurious, both to me and others. To say that persons have erred, or that they are pursuing a wrong course, would be bearable; but to assert that they are *rogues* and *thieves* is intolerable, and certainly most unjustifiable." "What I have said," replied Polyander, "I am determined to maintain." At this moment the whole of the company interfered, and said "that Polyander was greatly to blame, and that he had totally misunderstood Episcopius, who certainly had given him no reason for treating him thus." This rebuke seemed to bring him to a sense of shame, and endeavouring to make the best of his situation, he said, "O, gentlemen, we know each other very well:" and then addressing Episcopius with assumed playfulness, he said, "At a more convenient time I will tell you, sir, what you have done, both publicly and privately, to effect changes." To this he replied, "When you please, sir, I shall be ready to hear you." To which Polyander answered in a very rude manner; and continuing to treat Episcopius in a disrespectful way, the company again interposed, and said "that he certainly had mistaken the purport of his colleague's remarks." This declaration was accompanied with certain encomiums on the conduct and behaviour of the latter, indicating, though in an indirect way, their preference of him, which so stung Polyander

---

* Heinsius, here introduced as associated with the Remonstrants, was at this time professor of history in the university of Leyden. While the tide went in their favour, he identified himself with them, and, at the death of Arminius, he wrote some beautiful Latin verses on the mournful event, founded on a comparison of the deeds of one Hermann, a brave German, who had nobly resisted imperial Rome, and Arminius, who had attacked papal Rome. Anton, in his History of Germany, speaking of the former, says, Ein edler tapfer Jungling Herrmann Siegimers eines, Cheruskischen Fursten Sohn, ward der Retter seines Vaterlandes. These verses, which may be seen in Nichols' Life of Arminius, Heinsius thought it right to omit from every published edition of his works, the reason of which the reader will see when he is informed, that so soon as he discovered that the Contra-Remonstrants were gaining the ascendency, he attached himself to them, and, in consequence, was made secretary to the lay commissioners at the

---

Synod of Dort, and fell under the temptation, as is usual with apostates, of violently assailing his former friends, for the purpose of showing his new ones, as Luther says, *that he had got rid of the smell of the old tub.*

that he exclaimed, "Gentlemen, *I can bear nothing so ill as contempt.*"*

At length the dispute terminated, and they parted in a tolerably friendly manner. From this circumstance, however, our professor discovered how his colleague was affected toward him, and that it required the utmost prudence on his part to live in amity and peace with him. Nevertheless, he succeeded so far in accomplishing this, that he subsequently had no painful collision with him of a similar kind. But while he had the satisfaction of generally living with Polyander on terms of courteous regard and friendly civility, and beheld the increasing prosperity of the university under their joint labours, yet the pleasure arising from these circumstances must have been greatly diminished from the fact of his witnessing the bigotry of the Contra-Remonstrant clergy, driving the disagreement between themselves and the Remonstrants to a crisis. In many places individuals had refused to acknowledge them as brethren, and would not take the sacrament with them; but it belonged to the ministers of Amsterdam as a body, in a meeting assembled for the purpose, to denounce them publicly; and declare to the world that, *They could not own the Remonstrants as brethren without considering themselves guilty of wrong, or acknowledge them to be persons with whom they could hold Christian fellowship, seeing that they had a different doctrine from that of Christ, his apostles, and the Reformed Church; and until they openly disavowed and abandoned their opinions they must separate from them, as from those who were seeking to lay another foundation.*† And not satisfied with publishing this bigoted manifesto, they deputed certain persons of their party to proceed to different consistories in the Netherlands, to induce them to adopt similar measures, and proclaim the Remonstrants as unworthy of being received and treated as Christian brethren. Long before these proceedings, one or two ministers, as stated above, had seceded from them, and attempted to form distinct congregations; but their conduct was pronounced illegal, which, therefore, prevented its being imitated to any great extent; but the conduct of the Amsterdam clergy not only seemed to give legality to such secessions, but from their influence and number they warranted others to tread in their steps. As a consequence, all was tumult and confusion, and rents and discord prevailed on every side. The Contra-Remonstrants deposed the Remonstrants, and seized on their churches; while in other places, where the Remonstrants were the most numerous, something like retaliation was adopted. But with the Contra-Remonstrants these tumults not only originated, but their sanction of them was the cause of their more widely spreading. In support of the correctness of this statement, we may advert to the patronage given to one of their ministers, Rosseus, at the Hague, who refused to hold communion with Uitenbogaerdt, and who, with his adherents, violently seized one of the churches for the purpose of effecting an entire separation from the Remonstrants, on the alleged ground that their doctrines were such as were not to be tolerated.

---

* "At first," says Le Vassor, "the professors seemed to live together in good understanding. But that did not last long. Whether Polyander was jealous of Episcopius' reputation, he being a man of uncommon learning and a fine, subtle, penetrating wit, or whether zeal in defence of the doctrine of predestination urged him to oppose him, whatever it was, there was a rupture between them." Part ii, p. 18.

† Grotius remarks concerning this declaration, that it must appear very strange that the Contra-Remonstrants, who denounce the Remonstrants as heretics with whom they cannot, with a good conscience, hold Church fellowship, yet admit that they can hold communion with the Lutherans who disagree with them on the same points as the Remonstrants; which makes people doubt whether

Since the Amsterdam clergy assigned, as the reason of their denouncing the Remonstrants as not worthy of being treated as brethren, the circumstance of their holding doctrines different to those of Christ, his apostles, and the Reformed Church, we beg leave to lay before the reader a narrative of facts respecting the suspension of a minister, by them, for preaching what they called false doctrine, which will indirectly show what these worthies thought to be the doctrine of Christ, his apostles, and the Reformed Church, from which they considered him to

---

this was ever a matter of conscience with them, but rather a covering to effect their design of revolutionizing the government. Events proved the correctness of this opinion.—*Brandt*, vol. ii, p. 273.

have departed, and therefore proceeded to suspend him from his office as a false teacher. This person was named Simon Goulart. He had been a minister of the Walloon Church at Amsterdam for thirteen years, and had for his colleague a clergyman by the name of Maurois. This gentleman, though he had been always inclined to the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants, yet up to this period he had been tolerably moderate in his sentiments; and by the more bigoted of their party had been treated unkindly for not avowing himself more decidedly on what are strangely termed the doctrines of grace. Galled by the treatment he met with, and seeing the ministers of the Dutch Church thus denounce the Remonstrants, he was induced, on the thirteenth of September, in the year 1615, to preach a sermon on the unconditional election of some, and the absolute reprobation and damnation of others; in which he appears to have gone so far as to include infants among the number of those who were created for the purpose of being reprobated to everlasting misery. The sermon greatly disgusted Goulart, who thought himself bound immediately to counteract its effects, and in the afternoon of the same day, while expounding the section of the French catechism for the ninth Sunday, which treats of Christ's crucifixion and death, he concluded his remarks upon it in the following words: "Christ delivered us from the curse of law by becoming a curse for us; for it is written, *Cursed is he that hangeth on a tree;* so that instead of our being doomed to perdition under that *curse* which *Adam* brought upon himself and all his posterity, the *blessing* of *Christ*,* securing the possibility of salvation, comes in its place, he having obtained it for all mankind. But none can partake of so great a benefit but only believers, who lay hold on it by *faith*. As for unbelievers, who by their infidelity and ingratitude reject this benefit, they are excluded from it, and continue under the *curse*, according to the declaration of St. John, iii, 36, *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* He, therefore, that believes in the Son shall obtain the blessing, and as believing he is chosen to the blessing; but he that believes not the Son is prepared for the *curse*, and the *curse* remains upon him, as the apostle witnesses in his Epistle to the Galatians, iii, 9, 10, saying, that *they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.* And that, *as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse.* We must not imagine that the gracious God has appointed, by an absolute and unavoidable decree, any infants, especially of believing parents, from their mother's womb, to the everlasting torments of hell. This rash and foolish notion is incompatible with the words of God, *who will have all men to be saved*, 1 Tim. ii, 3; and, *who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe*, 1 Tim. iv, 10; and, *who has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth*, Ezek. xviii, 32. The door of his mercy and blessing, which our Saviour, *Christ*, hath opened, is shut against none. Are there any that remain under the *curse?* It is their own fault, so far as they, by their unbelief and unthankfulness, reject the blessing that is offered to them, and choose the curse; as it is said in the sixth Psalm, 17, *As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him; as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.* Let not, therefore, the mothers who now hear me, nor any other believing women that have children, ever fancy that any of them are thus appointed to the curse before their birth, in order to be cast into eternal fire. But much rather assure yourselves, ye believing parents, as often as you think of your children, or see them before your eyes, that Christ died for them; and that, by his bitter sufferings and death upon the cross, he has done away the *curse.* And when they attain to years of discretion, instruct them in the same assurance, to the end that, by laying hold of Christ and his blessing through faith, you and they may be made joint partakers of everlasting life."

---

* In an edition of this work now before us, printed in 1660, the first question and answer run thus:—

DIMANCHE IX.

M. Ce qu'il a esté crucifié, emporte-il quelque chose plustost que si on l'eust autrement fait mourir?

E. Oui, comme l'Apostre le remonstre, disant, qu'il a esté pendu au bois pour transporter nostre malediction sur soy-mesme, pour nous en descharger. Car ce genre de mort estoit maudit de Dieu.

These remarks,—probably delivered with a degree of warmth not usual with Goulart, for all parties admit that he was of a bland and amiable temper,—excited the disapprobation of his brother ministers, and he was accordingly summoned to appear before the consistory. Here it was asserted that in the aforesaid sermon there was a foundation laid for *Arminian Pelagianism*. And the consistory, after examining the subject at various sittings, finally decreed that he should be suspended from preaching and administering the sacrament, and not be admitted again to officiate at either unless he recanted the sentiments advanced in his sermon, and asked pardon for his violent preaching against the *established doctrine*, and should, likewise, on all occasions, assist in confuting the *innovations* of the *Remonstrants*. "He endeavoured," say the historians who state the particulars of this affair, "to quiet the clergy by offering to do three things:—first, to beg pardon of the Church on account of the warmth he was accused of, and so far to submit to their judgment: secondly, not to speak against the opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants for the time to come: and thirdly, to confine himself entirely within the bounds of Melancthon's opinions." They, however, insisted *that he should defend the doctrine he had opposed*; which he declared he could not do without displeasing God and wounding his own conscience. This being the case, he was suspended from the exercise of his ministry, and forbidden to sit with the ministers; and was ordered to take his seat in the body of the Church with the congregation as a layman. Attempts were made by Uitenbogaerdt to induce the magistrates of Amsterdam to interfere, and entreat the ministers to relax in their rigorous proceedings against him; but whether this was done we have no means of knowing, only that it is certain he was not restored, but, on the contrary, attached himself to the Remonstrants, and four years afterward, with many others of them, was banished from Holland on account of his opinions. Immediately after his suspension, and before his case came under the notice of the Walloon Synod, he published, in French and Dutch, that part of his sermon which was so offensive to the consistory, that the public might judge whether he deserved the treatment he had met with. He afterward also published a vindication of his conduct, under the following title: "An Answer to the Accusations drawn out of the Journal of the Walloon Consistory, to the Prejudice of Simon Goulart." We deem it right to give a few of these charges, which amounted to twenty-two, with Goulart's reply to them. The second, with which we shall commence, immediately relates to the principal charge, that of his opposing the doctrine of his colleague, and is thus expressed:—

That he had opposed the ministry of Maurois.

Answer.—This is not true; for I only opposed the false and rash opinion of those who assert that certain infants, born of believing parents, are, by an absolute decree of God, passed by, and abandoned to perdition. And Maurois and Barsecourt* assert that some children of believing parents are hated and rejected by God from their infancy. But I maintain that no infants born of believing parents are hated with such a hatred as God shows toward the devil and the damned. And I feel myself obliged to oppose those who do maintain such doctrines, as persons who are teaching things contrary to God's word.

That for these last five or six years he has maintained the opinions of the Remonstrants.

Answer.—I confess that I have approved the opinions of the Remonstrants ever since I understood them. I am not ashamed to own it; for their doctrines are conformable to the word of God; but those of others contradictory to it, and therefore false.

That he had said the door of mercy is open, and all men may be saved that please; seeing that it only depends on the will of men.

Answer.—These last words are equivocal, neither did I use them. I said, indeed, "that the door of mercy was open to all men, and that if they went not in it was their own fault, and not God's; and this I affirm to be true, and agreeable to the word of God, in which we are taught that *He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth,* 1 Tim. ii, 4: that Christ Jesus came into the world to save all, since *he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world,* 1 Tim. ii, 22: and Christ, in his address to the Jews, said, *But these things I say that ye might be saved:*

---

* It appears that they quoted the cases of Ishmael and Esau in proof of this horrible opinion.

and again, *And ye will not come to me, that ye might be saved*, John v, 34, 40.

That he owns he has not taught our doctrine these fourteen years.

Answer.—These words are equivocal; for if they mean the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, I have always taught it; but if by *our*, they mean that of the *Contra-Remonstrants*,—who teach that Christ did not come into the world to save all men, but only some, and the like points, —I have been so far from teaching those doctrines, that, on the contrary, I have frequently refuted them.

That he had owned he had concealed, for the space of thirteen years, which side he held with.

Answer.—This is a mistake; for those doctrines which I looked upon to be false from the beginning of my ministry, I have always opposed; especially the erroneous notions about the absolute rejection of any infant children born of believing parents. It is true, I never attacked that doctrine so publicly and formally as in the sermon I preached on the thirteenth of September, 1615; but because I never set my face against this error so positively and explicitly before, does it from thence follow that I never should or might do it.

That he cannot condemn the Remonstrants.

Answer.—When I was obliged to give an account of my sermon, there was no occasion for me to pronounce an opinion on the Remonstrants; when, therefore, I was asked by those of the consistory whether I approved of the doctrine of the Remonstrants or not, I looked upon it to be an unseasonable question, and told them that what I was properly to account for, was my sermon, and not the doctrine of the Remonstrants.

That he associated himself with the Remonstrants and with the magistrates.

Answer.—Why should I not keep company with men of virtue and honour?

That he never espoused the opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants, from the very beginning of his studies.

Answer.—The opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants are contradictory to the word of God, and the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, and involved in various ambiguities and contrarieties; and, therefore, it is not strange that I could not espouse them, especially since, from my first studies, I have given into that pure and orthodox opinion, "that Christ came into the world and suffered death for all, and not for some only."

That for thirteen years together he was a settled Remonstrant.

Answer.—I do not remember that I ever said so; nor is it likely that I should have said that I was a Remonstrant above thirteen years ago, there having been no mention of any such name till after the conference of the Hague, in the year 1611; from whence, likewise, appears the absurdity of the following accusation:—

That during the space of thirteen years he had resolved to adhere to the Remonstrants' opinion.

Answer.—And suppose it were so; then had I resolved to adhere to a good opinion, and one more consistent with the doctrine of the Reformed Churches than that of the Contra-Remonstrants; as I declared not long since to one of the deputies of Geneva.

This somewhat lengthened account we have thought it right to present to the reader, as it will show what were the thinkings of a certain class of the Dutch divines, and what the elements of that agency which, distinguished by bigotry and persecution, denounced so many holy and devoted men, with their friends and followers, as being unsound in Christian doctrine and opinion. And while it is believed that the horrible doctrine, opposed by Goulart, which maintains the reprobation of the greater part of the human family, as being created for that very purpose, infants included in the number, was not approved by all the Contra-Remonstrant ministers, yet it is evident that it was either publicly avowed or silently admitted by a great many of them, as well as by several of the laity, who adopted it from them.*

---

* To prove that this horrible doctrine was espoused by many Calvinist divines of that day, we shall give a few extracts from their writings, as copied by the Remonstrants and presented to the synod on the 14th of January, 1619. In this paper, they first give a lengthened statement of their own sentiments on the subject of predestination, and then proceed to object to the opinions of those who ranged themselves under the name of Calvin, many of whom were the writers of these passages, and were to be their judges. The section containing these quotations may be found in the *Acta*

In comparing the state of opinion among those persons who now bear the name of Calvinists, with those who were so denominated in Holland, in the year 1615, and who maintained the above sentiments, we cannot but re-

Remonstrantium, at page 44, part 2. That the reader may see that we deal fairly with these passages, we shall present the original in opposite columns to our translation:—

Membrum secundum quod rejicimus, est:

Etiam infantes aliquot fidelium in infantia sua ante ullum peccatum actuale in propria persona commissum, in hac vita decedentes, reprobis accenseri.

"*Infantum qui in Christo moriuntur, antequam operari aliquid potuerunt, diversa est ratio. Hi enim simpliciter aut servabuntur secundùm gratiam, aut damnabuntur secundùm naturam filii iræ, ut et reliqui.*"—Paræus in Rom. 2. *dub.* 9. *p.* 2, 32.	The condition of those infants who die in Christ before that they have been able to perform any act is different, for they will, as others, either be saved merely as the result of grace, or damned according to nature as children of wrath.
"*Quæ tamen promissio, cum non sit ita generalis, ut omnes comprehendat, ideó nemini sic* [*sine baptismo*] *decedenti ausim peculiariter promittere certam salutem. Sunt enim aliqui sanctorum filii, qui ad prædestinationem non pertinent.*" – Martyr Locis Comm. Class. 2 *cap.* 1, *n.* 32, *p.* 137.	For, since this promise is not so general as to comprehend all, therefore I dare not positively say that any, so dying [without baptism] will obtain eternal salvation. For there are some children of holy people, who do not belong to those who are predestinated to eternal life.
"*Multi sunt piorum infantes, ante ullum rationis usum morientes, tamen originalis illa peccati labes hominibus damnandis suffecerit.*"—Perkins.Armil.*cap.* 52, *p.* 281.	There are many infants of pious parents, who, dying before they have the use of their reason, nevertheless, on account of original sin, will be damned.
"*In reprobis infantibus executio Decreti Dei sic est: Ubi primùm nati sunt, ob primarii et natiui peccati reatum sibi relicti morientes, reprobantur in æternum.*"—Idem ibidem, *cap.* 53, *p.* 219.	The execution of the decree of God against reprobate infants is this:—As soon as they are born they are reprobated to eternal death; being left to themselves when dying, on account of the guilt of native and original sin.

Many more passages to the same effect might be selected from this MALIGN THEOLOGY,* but we judge the above will satisfy the reader.

---

* We borrow this designation from the work entitled FANATICISM: the

joice to know that if they are not completely discarded by the former, yet the admission of them is only by the *few*, and even these rarely dare to utter them, either in public discourses or in print: and when done, though in an indirect manner, yet even such an announcement of them rouses the just indignation of the more numerous and more benevolent of those who are designated Calvinists, and who have imbibed much of the charity and weeping sympathy of our holy and philanthropic religion. Into the cause of this mighty and beneficial change we need scarcely attempt to inquire, only we would just remark that, as in natural philosophy the extension of discovery, and the quickened state of human intellect, drive into the shade gross and palpable errors, which once had tenacious hold upon the thinkings of mankind, so the amended state of moral feeling, under the expansive influence of Christian benevolence, expels from the Church of God what is cruel, harsh, unjust, and contracted, in the opinions of its members. Two circumstances, growing out of this state of things, must be hailed by every benevolent mind. The first is, that of a wider expansion being given to the charities of its ministers, accompanied with a more enlarged and unfettered address to the consciences of sinners, of which the happy effects are seen in the crowded congregations and converted members of Churches under the pastoral care of those who now bear the designation of Calvinists; while the spirit of persecution, founded on the supposed right of cursing and hating those whom God had before cursed and hated, has given way with the horrible doctrine itself. In support of these positions we shall present the reader with extracts from two modern Calvinistic writers, which deserve attention from the force and eloquence of the sentiments they contain, independently of their being so appropriate to the positions we have advanced. The first is from "*Discourses on some important Theological Subjects, Doctrinal and Practical*; by the REV. WILLIAM HULL:" which were published at the unanimous request of the students

---

writer of which, we perceive, from his introductory essay to *Edwards' Freedom of the Will*, wishes to be considered a Calvinist. This circumstance, it is probable, may induce him not to approve of our thus using it; but we shall leave the unprejudiced reader to judge whether it is not here appropriately introduced.

of the Weymondly Theological Institution, and therefore must have been approved of by these gentlemen, there preparing for the public ministry. The one from which we select the following passage is the first, "the object of which is to oppose the tenet, that the death of Christ had an exclusive reference to" what is designated "the salvation of the elect," and is designed to show that the more expansive and benevolent views of Baxter are superior to those of President Edwards:—

"Of the happy effects produced on the Christian ministry by the more enlarged interpretation of the extent of the death of Christ, as implying a probationary state, a striking illustration occurs in the preaching and writings of Richard Baxter, compared with those of Jonathan Edwards. Both were men of prodigious intellect, and of piety not less distinguished, so that it would be difficult to select their equals from among the greatest and best of the human race. It is therefore extremely interesting to observe the different effects produced upon the minds of such men by their different views of Divine truth. Something, no doubt, may be put to the account of original character and temperament, which led to the adoption, by each, of their several views of the Divine administration. But again, their principles would tend to fix that character, and foster that temperament. Baxter, proceeding on the broad ground of the Scriptures, and making his metaphysics subservient to a scheme of doctrine accordant with the unsophisticated moral sense, is remarkable for the fervour and energy of his appeals, the tenderness of his expostulations, the glow of expansive feeling with which he portrays the love of God to a revolted world, and the noble freedom with which he applies the various topics which suggest themselves to his mighty genius, to the hopes, the fears, the trembling passions, the awakened reason, the consciousness of responsibility, which no guilt of apostasy has expelled from the human breast. He takes his stand upon the unassailable principle, 'No man in the world doth perish for Adam's sin alone.' The theology of Edwards, more systematic, and apparently more consistent, because its doctrines were squared to a metaphysical theory, was founded upon absolute predestination, not to be *distinguished* from the philosophical *ne-*

cessity of Hartley, Hume, and Priestley, but by the attempt to engraft upon it the great doctrines of Christianity, and to reconcile with it a moral administration, terminating in eternal rewards and punishments. His preaching and his practical writings accord precisely with what might be expected from such a system, embraced by a man of transcendent ability and devotion. In his hortatory addresses to the ungodly, while he aims to awaken his own sensibilities with a view to the sympathy of others, it is evident that his native intensity of feeling is oppressed by some deadening power, some dark spell, which sits with leaden and icy influence upon his soul. His address has the awfulness, together with the cold and dreary majesty of fate; and when he discourses on his favourite topics,—'The wicked useful in their destruction only,'—'Sinners in the hands of an angry God,'—'The justice of God in the damnation of sinners,'—it is with a calmness that is terrible—the unperturbed tranquillity of a man who has reasoned out his point, and then pronounces his stern conclusion with the oracular voice of destiny. When Baxter, as in the Saints' Rest, describes the misery of those who lose it, he makes us feel that he was a man of like passions with others, that his own spirit flinches and recoils from the contemplation of scenes which duty compels him to exhibit to a regardless world. Like the Redeemer, he weeps over lost souls. But when Edwards suspends the reprobate sinner, as by a hair, over the flaming abyss of perdition, we feel as if in the presence of one of the ministers of Divine wrath, who has himself no compunctious visitings of nature, but with complacent firmness executes the judgments of Heaven. Nor are we surprised, after witnessing his own self-possession while indulging in the most appalling imaginations, to be told by him, that to behold the miseries of the lost will be a capital ingredient in the cup of immortal fruition. 'The wicked,' he says, 'will be destroyed and tormented in the view of the saints and other inhabitants of heaven; when the saints in heaven shall look upon the damned in hell, it will prove to them a greater sense of their own happiness; the misery of the damned will give them a greater sense of the distinguishing grace and love of God to them, that he should from all eternity set his love on them, and make so great a difference between them and others, who are of the same species, and have deserved no worse of God than they. When they shall look upon the damned, and see their misery, how will heaven ring with the praises of God's justice toward the wicked, and his grace toward the saints!' While we revere the memory of each of these illustrious servants of God, it does not seem difficult to determine which of the two breathed most of the spirit of Christ; and the presumption is in favour of that *class of principles* whose tendency was to produce the nearest resemblance to the apostolic ministry."*

---

* Of those persons who could thus contemplate with "unperturbed tranquillity, and a calmness that is terrible," the anticipated misery of the reprobate, we must consider, if not the editors of a Calvinistic periodical, entitled "The Spiritual Magazine or Saints' Treasury," yet at least their correspondent, (E. M.) This man, who not only seems to be without any "compunctious feelings," but also capable of despising those who have any, in an article in their Supplement of 1833, headed "*God's Will, not Creature's Affection, the Ground of Spiritual Prayer*," answers P., an inquirer, who asks, "Is it or is it not the privilege and duty of the believer to pray for those with whom he is connected by the ties of nature?"—"I assert it is not, because it is contrary to the revealed will of God, who has destined a certain number to people the heavens. This is enough for faith to plead, and not for feeling, or the fleshly will, which blunders on in the dark. What right have we to ask the Lord to alter his mind, when he has said, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and whom I will I harden.*" He then adds, "If P. prefers to worship so, I choose to worship in the light." P., it appears, in a former communication, had quoted the following statement of St. Paul, in justification of a father feeling that affection and religious anxiety for his children's salvation which would prompt him to pray for them, *I have great heaviness and sorrow in my heart, for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.* "Here," he says, "P. and Paul are agreed, but I will not join them. That Paul here spoke the truth of his mind I do believe, but that he spoke the truth of God I do question." To say nothing of the impiety of such a statement in relation to an inspired apostle, we can but remark that although this writer adds, "We follow Paul no farther than he followed Christ," yet how could Christ, according to E. M., be considered as exempt from the intimated charge of following "fleshly feeling" more than Paul, seeing that Luke says that, *When he came near the city and beheld it, he wept over it, saying, O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not.* Ch. xix, 41, and xiii, 34. To us it appears that E. M., to be consistent, ought to

Our second extract, designed to show the tendency of the doctrine opposed by Goulart to cherish a spirit of persecution, is from the author of the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, who, in his FANATICISM, says that "the conceptions we form of the Divine Being, and our feelings toward our fellow men, are always dependent one upon the other. And the imputation of malevolence, in any form, to the supreme Being, brings with it the supposition that certain portions of mankind are the objects and the victims of Divine malediction, and therefore may be, or

view the Redeemer with pious scorn and holy indignation when weeping over the prospective ruin of those *of whom concerning the flesh Christ came*, and as acting "under feeling and fleshly will, which blunders in the dark." We do not wish to charge such writers with wantonly committing impiety, but we may apply to them the following description, which will probably account for the adoption of such sentiments: "These are stern natures. They are not cold as water, but cold as marble; not solid as ice, but solid as iron. They shed no tears, and have no power of relenting, because there are no humours or lymph at all in their constitutions. Every nerve is a chord stretched till it vibrates, and which will sooner snap than relax. There are born a few men, (*men*, for they have bones and muscles, senses and bodily organs,) and especially do such make their appearance under the wing of gloomy superstitions, who, themselves quite exempt from social affections, and unconscious of the soft alternations of hope and fear, grief and joy, look with grim contempt upon humanity—even as a man may look upon the most ignoble of the brutal orders."—*Fanaticism.*

But while this statement may be explanatory of the cause which originates such sentiments as the above with some persons, yet with others the pure love of creed alone has led to their adoption.

We shall never forget the case of a lady, the mother—and naturally a tender, affectionate mother—of a fine family, to whom it was intimated, when advocating the doctrine of absolute election and reprobation, that if the opinion she maintained was true, it might bear with an awful aspect on her own children. Winding herself up to meet the statement, she answered, with a calm front, a glassy eye, an unblanched cheek, and an air of assumed indifference, "I can't help that; neither indeed have I any right to allow my feelings as a mother to be excited in opposition to the Divine purposes." E. M. would undoubtedly approve of the feigned sternness of such a person, as being one of those whom he calls *spiritual*, in opposition to P., whom, by implication, he intimates to be a *mongrel Calvinist*, following "fleshly will and fleshly feeling." Nay, what is more, he insinuates that the solicitude he shows for the salvation of his children is Arminian feeling, a statement which the writer takes as a compliment to the benevolent creed of the Dutch professor.

ought to be contemned, tormented, destroyed. Is it theory only, or is it matter of history, that MALIGN THEOLOGY has invariably been followed at hand by intolerance, execrations, cruelties? Thus it is, that, as the belief or imputation of malevolence (under any disguise of abstract terms) to the supreme Being contradicts or distorts the genuine notion of sovereign or impartial JUSTICE, to the tribunal of which nothing is amenable but *crime*, so the correspondent feeling toward mankind, which such a belief engenders, is not that of righteous disapprobation on the score of moral offences; but that of detestation and abhorrence, on the mysterious ground of ecclesiastical impurity. It is not as the transgressors of a holy law, but as the *reprobate* of Heaven, that men and classes of people are shut out from the circle of our charities. Here such are spurned as abominable, much more than as guilty. And when once so grievous a perversion of feeling has taken place, then the whole of the force which belongs to our instinctive notions of retribution, or to our acquired belief of future judgment, is thrown into the channel of our sectarian aversions; and, therefore, like a mountain torrent, in so passing from an open to a narrow bed, gains new impetuosity. Ingenuous disapproval becomes covert rancour; virtuous indignation slides into implacable revenge; and scorn completely excludes, not only all indulgence toward the frailty of men, but all compassion for their sorrows."*

---

* Perhaps the application of these sentiments to theologians who hold the doctrine of reprobation, may be deemed unfair and uncandid by moderate Calvinists. Nevertheless, as they would not scruple to admit this doctrine to be a species of MALIGN THEOLOGY, as it was held by some doctors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who bore the name of the Geneva reformer, so they must be equally aware that the men who advocated it were persecutors. The account given by Chandler of Servetus' death awfully proves Calvin to have been a dark persecutor. Beza wrote a tract in favour of persecution, which Bogerman, the president of the Synod of Dort, translated; the Dutch divines recommended it, and the Synod of Dort acted upon it. It may be said, as a set off to these facts, that many of these were pious men, and are to be forgiven on that account. Let this be granted, and it only proves "that gloomy doctrines are to be execrated, because even without them or where every influence is the most favourable, human nature scarcely avoids abusing the profound excitements of religion as the incentives or the pretexts of its malignant passions."—*Fanaticism.*

Never was the truth of any sentiment more fully verified by the history of facts, than was the latter in the treatment of the magistrates and ministers toward Goulart and the other Remonstrant clergy, after they were condemned by the Synod of Dort. There was not only the absence of all "compassion for their sorrows," but an actual mockery of their sufferings, manifested in a course of jeering and taunting toward them, which, thank God, bad as human nature is, it is only capable of showing under the dictate of religious bigotry and persecution. The facts in proof of this statement we shall have to notice when we come to that portion of their history which treats of their condemnation and banishment.

We must now return to that part of our narrative in which we stated the circumstance of Goulart being discharged from exercising his ministry, and ordered henceforth to take his place in the Church as a layman. The event excited great disgust in the minds of many of those

Were proof wanting of the correctness of this sentiment, we might adduce the conduct of Diodati, himself an Italian Protestant refugee, who, when sheltered from persecution by the Calvinistic magistrates of Geneva, not merely turned persecutor, but, when Barneveldt was murdered for *vexing the Church of God*, that is, opposing Calvinism, he could sportingly say *that the canons of Dort had shot off the lord advocate's head;*[*] and, to keep up his impious jesting, he might have added that, as one of the canonists,[†] he had assisted in furnishing the powder and the match to accomplish this dark deed. When it is known that this Italian stands eminent with some for his professed piety, is it inappropriate, after this recital, to quote in connection with it the following sentiments? "Of all the preparations for atrocious crime, none is more ominous or complete than a presumption of possessing superhuman virtue. Sanctity of this heroic and immortal order may dip its hands in blood, and fear no stain! Illusions such as these, egregious as they may seem, are not foreign to the human mind. The holy arrogance of the soul, so long as it can be held entire, is a warrant that will cover all extents of guilt. There is no murder in murder, no falseness in perjury, no sin in any sin, if but the perpetrator is inflated with the persuasion of himself being a demigod in goodness."—*Idem.*

---

[*] *Diodati* avoit ete depute au fameux Synod de Dordrecht, en 1618; et lorsqu'il apprit la malheurse fin de Barneveldt, avocat-general de Hollande, il dit que *les canons du Synode de Dordrecht avoient emporte la tete de l' Avocat de Holland;* et ce jeu de mots reafermoit une verite.—*Dictionaire Historique*, Tome Quatrieme, Article *Diodati.*

[†] He was one of those appointed to draw up the canons of the synod.

who were accustomed to sit under his sermons with great pleasure. For, besides being most amiable in his temper, and pleasing in his manner, he was very pious, and a superior preacher. The offended party, after having first earnestly memorialized the synod of the Walloon Churches, and subsequently the magistrates of Amsterdam, to obtain his restoration to the ministry, and being repulsed, or disregarded, were at length determined to provide a separate place for public preaching; which being done, they obtained the assistance of a French student by the name of Jacobus Batelier, who had adopted the sentiments of the Remonstrants, to preach to them. They accordingly met about three times without the least interruption; most probably because their number was very small: but when others, who had espoused similar sentiments, joined with them and swelled their number, the attention of the public was attracted, and the more bigoted clergy and magistrates took the alarm, and opposition soon began to manifest itself. The first instance was in the case of several of the zealous Contra-Remonstrants, who attended these meetings to mark what might pass among them. Of these was the blacksmith who formerly ran after Episcopius with a piece of hot iron: and who, when the preacher quoted the following words of our Lord in his sermon, *Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life*, exclaimed, *You lie*. This created a momentary excitement, which was, however, soon allayed by some person rising and saying, "that if any individual present had any thing to object to the doctrine of the minister, he would be perfectly willing to see him after the service, when he would reply to his objections."

The place that was procured for preaching being found too small, the Remonstrants hired a large warehouse that would hold fifteen hundred persons, which they fitted up in a hasty manner, for the accommodation of the people who flocked to hear the doctrines adopted by them. Among the persons who had taken a conspicuous part in these measures, were some of the most respectable citizens; such as Rem Bisschop, a merchant, and Lawrence Real, secretary to the admiralty, with several others of the same class of people. But their condition and respectability as citizens were no defence for them against the bigotry of some, and the rude attacks of others. Under pretences of zeal for the true faith, in opposition to the Remonstrants, who were said to be laying a new foundation in supporting the five points, several bigots *very piously* went to protest against the doctrines there to be delivered: and among them we are mortified to have to record the deeds of an ENGLISH fanatic, by the name of BROMLEY. This man sat near the pulpit, and at the close of the sermon stood up, and with a stentorian voice exclaimed, "Men and brethren! I know that I am a sinner, and that there are persons here much better than I, but is there nobody moved with the Spirit of the Lord to speak?" and no one answering to his call, he roared out, "Do they not preach differently from Plancius, Triglandius, and Hillius?" when some of his party answered, "YES, YES." He then shouted, in a way worthy of David George himself, "O Amsterdam, Amsterdam! how art thou fallen!" This was enough, and his friends piously cried out, "Down with the preacher! down with the schismatical fellow!" which, in their zeal, they soon attempted, but were prevented by the courage of the women, who actually surrounded the pulpit, and prevented them from accomplishing their orthodox deed. The mob without, however, broke open the doors, rushed in, and all was confusion. The minister fortunately escaped, or they had intended to have taken away his life, by throwing him over one of the bridges. Being disappointed in the accomplishment of their dark purpose, they manifested their revenge in demolishing the pulpit where he had preached false doctrine, and the seats where the congregation had sat to hear it. The Remonstrants made an appeal to the magistrates for redress, who, instead of assisting them, insisted that they should give up the warehouse to the owner, and cease to hold any more public meetings, which was accordingly done.

But the furious spirit that had been kindled in the people by the bigoted addresses from the pulpit of the Calvinistic clergy, was attended with still more violent effects. During the whole of the week after this disgraceful scene notices and placards were issued through the city, expressive of the designs of certain persons on the property of the Remonstrants. And, as a pretext for the accomplishment of their purposes, Sunday was fixed upon, as it was intended to ground an attack on Rem Bisschop's house, on the alleged crime of his holding a private meeting of the Remonstrants there. Nothing could be more false; for being aware of the excitement produced against them, the latter gave up the design of holding any more meetings for the present. It was, however, made the pretext of attacking this respectable citizen, who had his house broken open, and plundered in the middle of the day, by a furious mob; and that, too, with the perfect knowledge and connivance of some of the magistrates, who were violent Contra-Remonstrants. This was especially the case with the burgomaster, Paw, who has before been named as the great enemy of Grotius and the Remonstrants. This man, when it was proposed in an assembly of the council, held the day before, that one of the four burgomasters should stay at home, for the purpose of ordering the city militia to keep quietness, offered to take that duty upon himself; but when the expected riot took place, which was near his dwelling, and the mob proceeded to attack and plunder Rem Bisschop's house, he never once made his appearance, or ordered the soldiers to disperse them; and when he was applied to, to prevent the plundering, he refused to do it, saying that he could not act without his brother magistrates; though he had offered, and was actually the person appointed by them, to keep the city in peace, and had soldiers placed at his disposal for that purpose. He, therefore, suffered the plundering to go forward, almost under his own eyes; and not till the greater part of the property was destroyed, or carried away, did he interfere, which was toward the evening of the day.

This conduct on the part of Paw, and a few others of the magistrates, who were the intimate friends of Plancius and others, whom the fanatic Englishman, Bromley, held up as preaching the truth in opposition to the Remonstrants, greatly offended some of the most respectable and liberal of the citizens. They felt that the first city of the United Provinces was disgraced by such proceedings, and a gentleman, a magistrate of high character, who had himself several times filled the office of burgomaster, and who, as a neighbour of Rem Bisschop, had witnessed the whole, makes the following remarks on the subject. After intimating that the officers of the militia walked before Paw's house for some length of time, and that, too, within sight of the plundering, but received no orders from him to prevent it, he says, "What apology can there be made, that in a city where there are four schouts and their officers, and, beside the usual watch and patrol, there are eighteen companies of soldiers, a riot of some hundred boys and a few men was not opposed, I say, that such things should be acted in the sight of heaven, and in the presence of burghers and inhabitants of all sorts, (for there were, as near as I could judge, a hundred spectators to one rioter,) in the midst of the day, and in the chief part of the city, and not only against a citizen born here, but a gentleman, who, at the request of the burgomasters, has for many years, with great zeal and not without danger, taken upon himself the government of the city, is indeed strange."

Some few of the rioters were afterward seized, but scarcely rebuked; and one of the most rigid of the Contra-Remonstrant magistrates had the effrontery and bigotry to say *that these people acted out of zeal for religion, and actions done on account of religion ought to be treated tenderly*; and yet, adds Limborch, that the reader may know what was the degree of religious knowledge these people had, who were to be dealt with so tenderly, after stealing their neighbours' goods, I shall state the following fact:—A sawyer, who, when charged with carrying away linen, which he denied, though he was seen letting a part of it fall as he was taking it away, was then asked, "Why he went into the house at all?" He answered, "From zeal against those Arminians." "And why have you such enmity against the Arminians?" He replied, "Because he thought such fellows should not be suffered to preach, who asserted *that one man was appointed to damnation, and the other to salvation*." This was an awkward reply, as containing a statement of the very doctrine advocated by the magistrates, but opposed by the Arminians; and to support which the former were very piously winking at the conduct of such a fellow, and throwing the shield of their protection over him, for having, through zeal for religion, robbed the house of a pious and respectable citizen, under an impression that the man whom he was injuring held the opinion thus stated, and which he thought the magistrates opposed, but which proved to be just the contrary. These worthy orthodox burgomasters got out of this scrape by dismissing this helpmate of theirs, lest he might blab something more that might be equally disagreeable.

But now comes the more painful view of the business, that of the conduct of the Calvinist clergy of the city. These gentlemen had always been violent, and in the time of Arminius, as will be seen by referring to his letter at page 55, and other documents, had been the occasion of all the uproar and dissensions in the Church of Holland, and were, it is to be feared, if not the originators of these scandalous transactions, yet, by their silence, the indirect patrons of them. And hence it is to be remarked, that while all the other ministers belonging to the other bodies of Christians publicly denounced these outrageous proceedings in their various congregations, and admonished their hearers not to take part in such measures; yet when the minister, Ursinus, was asked by a person, "Why the people belonging to their congregations could not dissuade their sons from taking part in the riot at Rem Bisschop's house, as well as the *Lutherans* and *Mennonites?*" he answered, *We have our reasons for not doing it;* when the other rejoined, *And so have I my reasons for not approving of your conduct.* To the fact of the perfect silence of the Contra-Remonstrant clergy on this disgraceful affair, the above writer bears testimony when he asks, "Have we ever heard any of our ministers condemn these proceedings from the pulpit before the congregation? I could never learn that they did, and I am sure I myself never heard them. Does not this afford cause of suspicion that what has happened is agreeable to our clergy, and if not to all, yet, at least, to some of them? But let the parties who patronize the mob beware; for if they be allowed to proceed, they will soon make no distinction between such as they nickname *Arminians* and others; and all those who have any thing to be robbed of will be declared *Arminians*, and they will proceed to their work, adopting the language of the famous pirate, Michiels, who styled himself *God's friend, but the enemy of all mankind.*"

The correctness of these sentiments the Contra-Remonstrants soon learned; and though, as it is asserted by credible writers that in the first instance they actually distributed money to the rioters to encourage them in their villany, yet they soon found that they were incapable of being restrained from threatening their property, by any sense of obligation on account of what they had received from them. Hence it is stated of one of their patrons, who was looking with approbation upon their acts of plunder and demolition, that she said to a person standing near her, *See how zealous these people are:* when immediately after, one of the plunderers passing by, pointed to her residence, and said to his comrade, *This will make a fine Arminian house:* which led the person to whom she had made the above remark, wittily to retort, *Do you hear how zealous these people are?* She felt the justice of this retort, and retired with fear and shame. The rioters likewise began to look with a very wistful eye toward the bank, and gave broad hints of their desires to be put in possession of its treasures, which coming to the ears of the Contra-Remonstrant magistrates, they put an end to their outrages, though they so far shielded them for the good deeds they had already done, as only to inflict a punishment on some few of the ringleaders, which amounted to a mere mockery of justice.

"This calamity," says Limborch, "Rem Bisschop bore with the greatest patience, and the day after he had suffered the destruction and robbery of his property, to the amount of five thousand florins,* he sat down to write an account of the whole affair to send to his brother Episcopius." The letter containing it was retained in the family, and was in the possession of Limborch at the time he was writing the memoirs of Episcopius, and according to the statement of this gentleman, it exhibited all the marks of perfect composure and equanimity, so that the narrative appeared as if written by a person who was relating what had happened to another, rather than to himself. The information it conveyed was of course very distressing to Episcopius; nevertheless all the letters he sent to his brother on the business, and which are still extant, abound, says his biographer, with exhortations to patience, without the slightest expressions that could look like any thing that would foster a revengeful or unforgiving spirit.

---

* The Dutch florin is two shillings, in English money.

The Thursday after the plundering of his house, Rem Bisschop was waited upon by two elders, in the name of the consistory, to forbid him and his wife being present at the sacrament, which was to be administered on the next Sunday. Bisschop inquired for what reason, adding, "Pray is it on account of my having behaved in any way unbecoming a Christian while witnessing the storming of my house, and the plundering of my goods, and that, too, with danger to the life of myself and wife, that I am thus to be excluded from the Lord's table?" They said, "By no means; on the contrary, you have behaved yourself in a very becoming and Christian manner, but since you are now in trouble, it is not thought proper by the consistory to state their reasons for thus prohibiting you from attending the sacrament; and for the present we have nothing more to say to you." The fact is, they intended to excommunicate him, with John Lawrence Real, secretary to the admiralty, and son to the late Lawrence Jacob Real, with several others, as will be noticed in a subsequent part of these memoirs.

This latter gentleman, whose name is thus introduced from Brandt's account of this transaction, was a distinguished individual in Dutch history, and therefore the treatment of his son, by a bigoted party who were gaining the ascendancy by their factious measures, was considered by this writer as deserving the greater reprobation. This person was not only eminent in his day, from the rank he held in life as a schepen or alderman of the city of Amsterdam, and one of the admiralty directors of Zealand, but an early defender of and sufferer for religious liberty. In 1566 he was instrumental in introducing the Protestant ministry into Holland. Under his protection, the first sermon was delivered in a field near Horn, on July the fourteenth, 1566, and in 1567 he was forced to leave Holland, and retire to Emden, to escape the fangs of that monster, the Duke of Alva. In his perilous voyage his daughter, Elizabeth Real, accompanied him, then about fourteen years of age, who afterward became the wife of the celebrated Arminius. It was deeply mortifying to the Remonstrants to see themselves persecuted by a race of bigoted upstarts, who had done nothing to secure the liberties of their country. Of this the venerable Hooft bitterly and justly complained, saying, "It is true, the old *Gueuxes*[*] *are to be driven away* by gentlemen who concealed themselves in the shade during the heat of the day, and who now take the lead in public affairs, and that, too, to persecute and oppress those who were obliged to wander about, and seek refuge in foreign countries. I am one of those who, from the twenty-second year of my age till past thirty, was forced to absent myself from this city. But in the time of the good old *Gueuxes* people durst not attempt such things as are now on the anvil, for they would have been far from suffering them."

---

[*] The origin of the application of this term to those of the reformed religion, as used by Hooft, was as follows:—A remonstrance was presented against the establishment of the inquisition in the Netherlands by the Dutch people, confederated for that purpose. The confederates were some of the most eminent of the Belgian nobles. They entered Brussels, where the court of the duchess of Parma, the governante of the Low Countries, was held, on the 5th of April, 1566, and, on the following day, walked in solemn procession to the palace.[*] Their demeanour was highly imposing, from their mingled air of forbearance and determination. All Brussels thronged out to gaze and sympathize with this extraordinary spectacle of men whose resolute step showed they were no common suppliants, but whose modest bearing had none of the seditious air of faction. The governante was greatly agitated by their presence, when one of her ministers, to encourage her, said, Madam, why are you afraid of such a *tas de* GUEUX, a band of beggars? The fact was that though the confederates were generally of noble families, yet several, from mismanagement in their affairs or from some other causes, were reduced to such a state of poverty, as in some measure to justify the sarcasm. At an entertainment given in the evening to three hundred of them, by a leading nobleman, they were debating as to the name they should take, when instantly the title of *Gueux* was proposed, and received with acclamation. The reproach it was originally intended to convey became neutralized, as its general application to men of all ranks and fortunes concealed its effect as a stigma on many to whom it might seriously be applied. To give effect to the appropriation of this designation to the confederates, Brederode, the nobleman who entertained them, procured a wallet, such as is worn by beggars, and slung it across his shoulders, as the sign of union and fidelity among them; and the more effectually to stamp the proceedings with solemnity, he took a cup or porringer, and drank the health of all present, and then swore fidelity to their cause. The cup and wallet next went round the company, when each drank, and solemnly swore to be equally faithful to the compact, *Jusqu a la besace*, even to the wallet or beggary. The wallet was next hung upon a nail, driven into the wall for that purpose, and gazed upon with enthusiastic admiration. What had been resolved upon in a scene of revelry was subsequently acted upon in their more serious and calm moments; and the excitement produced by this ceremony,

[*] "They marched in goodly order," says Grimestone, "five in rank, toward the court, being about four hundred noblemen and gentlemen." See pp. 255, 6, and 7, where a full account of this affair will be found

CHAPTER IX.

Periods of religious excitement and strife are those which of all others furnish the least correct data on which to form an opinion of the character and sentiments of those who have been designated and treated as heretics. This chiefly arises from the watchful jealousy of the spirit of religious controversy rendering men at once more sensitive and quick-sighted to the appearance of error, and dogmatical in the denunciation of those who are supposed to depart from opinions generally received as orthodox. Terms and phrases used in relation to certain abstruse points of theology, which, at other times, would pass unheeded, are at these periods pronounced as erroneous and dangerous by the suspicious fears of parties who claim the right of acting as the guardians of truth. This is done, not from its being asserted that they absolutely

---

so ridiculous in itself, ended in sublime results. Rallying signs and watch words were adopted and soon displayed. It was thought that nothing better suited the occasion than the immediate adoption of the costume as well as the title of beggary. In a very few days the city streets were filled with men in grey cloaks, fashioned on the model of those used by mendicants and pilgrims. Each confederate caused this uniform to be worn by every member of his family, and replaced with it the livery of his servants. Several fastened to their girdles or their sword hilts small wooden drinking cups, clasp knives, and other symbols of the begging fraternity. Thus arose the use of the term *Gueuxes*, a designation afterward applied to all the inhabitants of the Netherlands who embraced the cause of the Reformation.—*Brandt, Crowe, Grotius, and Grimestone.*

assume the form of heresy, but from their supposed bearing as such, though remotely, upon some article to be held inviolable, because deemed vital and important, and therefore the hand of ecclesiastical power is stretched forth to suppress the incipient errors they involve, and crush the heresiarch who has dared to broach them. In cases of this kind, he who takes upon himself the high office of defender of the orthodoxy of a Church, is too much in danger of attempting to prove that he can justly support his claims to this assumed pre-eminence by erecting certain new and critical rules for judging of its genuine features. And while framing a fine theory that may satisfy himself in accomplishing this object, it not unfrequently happens that, when produced, it becomes a snare to others by furnishing occasions of perplexity and doubt on orthodox points, where none had existed, but for these new and refined rules by which they were to be determined.

Unfavourable as such a mode of proceeding is to the unity of a Church, the more dangerous consequences are to be seen in its arming this defender of the truth with that sectarian bigotry which, in its manifestations, exhibits a strange anomaly in the actings of the mind that feels unruffled in contemplating him whose errors are wide from what is deemed the standard of orthodoxy, while it evinces its strongest marks of displeasure toward the individual whose sentiments are but a shade below the standard of this self-created judge of correct thinking. This fact was noticed by Hume, who adverted to it in sarcastic language, and pointed to it as the reproach of Christians. Nothing can be more fatal to the peace and stability of a Church than that of its legislating upon certain difficult questions, and making uniformity of opinion on them necessary to Church fellowship. Such proceedings are not only injurious by giving rise to a scrupulous and disputatious spirit upon points on which, it is probable, the sacred Scriptures, if not silent, yet state them as matters belonging to the mysteries of our holy religion, to be admitted and not defined, while he who chooses to become their expounder, and makes his exposition the rule of faith, feels his superiority assailed by the man who dares to dispute his interpretations, and he is prompted at once to anathematize and condemn him, with ecclesiastical arrogance. On this ground the most trifling departures from what are supposed to be points of orthodoxy, are condemned as heretical, and the party adopting them is made to suffer consequent pains and penalties.

That the history of the Dutch Church at this period, furnished evidence of the correctness of these sentiments, is known to every person conversant with the ecclesiastical affairs of the Low Countries. We might give many instances in proof of this statement, but we select the following, in preference to others, on account of its being connected with the subject of these memoirs. The case was that of a clergyman by the name of Venator, minister of Alkmaer. This person, the reader will recollect, was one of those who waited upon Episcopius, with certain lay gentlemen, to induce him to accept the invitation of the magistrates and people of that place to become one of their ministers. He appears to have imbibed liberal principles, and though not exactly identified with the Remonstrants, yet he had refused to sign some of the articles drawn up by the bigoted Calvinist clergy of his consistory, and therefore came under their displeasure, and was suspected of heterodoxy.

In the year 1616, he published a work entitled, "*Theologia vera et mera infantium et lactantium in Christo,*—True and pure theology for infants and babes in Christ;" which gave his enemies a handle to charge him with heresy; and they were enabled so far to carry their measures against him, as to ruin him in his affairs, by obtaining his banishment from Alkmaer. The evidence by which this charge was supported, was not drawn so much from what he had said, as from what he had not said. He was convicted of heterodoxy more by implication than from its being proved that his publication contained any thing heretical. It is true, the Contra-Remonstrants complained to the States of Holland, that he had made certain statements respecting the Godhead of Christ and other fundamental points which were at variance with the formulary, and injurious to the Christian religion; and the States, after receiving this complaint, sent the document containing it to the divinity professors at Leyden, on the fourth of March, in order that they might examine the work, and make their report of it to them. This was done in writing, on the tenth of the same month, and was as follows:—

"That unless the writer more fully and distinctly explain himself, he must be considered as giving great occasion for suspicion of his cherishing sentiments opposed to the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ, as well as some articles of the Christian religion as they are inserted in the formulary. Moreover, he has stated others in the way of question and answer, calculated to excite suspicion of his being heterodox on certain other points contained in the said formulary. And, finally, that he has in his treatise laid down such general principles as terms of acceptance with God, as to set aside, it is believed, the absolute necessity of the reception of Christianity in order to salvation, and in this way opened a wide door to all persons, of whatever sect of religion or persuasion they may be, provided that they fear God and keep his commandments; thereby intimating that Jews, Turks, or heathens, as well as all sorts of Christians, may be admitted to eternal life, which is contrary to Scripture."

Of the justice of this report we can say nothing; nevertheless, we can but regret to see Episcopius placed in circumstances in which his strong attachment to, and vigorous advocacy of, "the liberty of prophesying," was for this once broken down, and it will be seen that before he had done with this affair, he evinced, we think, a sense of compunction and shame at his concurrence in those measures which prepared the way for this man to be consigned to beggary and disgrace. Such statements as these, let the reader understand, are not made either by Limborch, or the Latin editor of the memoirs of Episcopius; but, according to our views of the business, we should think that we were adopting an unfair mode of proceeding, if we allowed ourselves to be so far blinded or prejudiced by our admiration of the splendid talents of Episcopius, as not to make the above statement.

Uitenbogaerdt, who was no incompetent judge, to his honour be it named, seems to have been the only person who spoke in favour of the book, and condemned the proceedings of the professors. He said that he thought they had yielded too much to the evil surmises of certain persons, and concealed the good things contained in the work, inasmuch as it was understood to comprise the principal points of religion, and, with fine and strong arguments, urged the duties of repentance and of a devout and holy life.

On the report of the professors, the States ordered the copies to be secured, as far as possible, and to be destroyed. They also summoned Venator to the Hague, to be examined before Polyander and Episcopius, on the seventeenth of March, in the presence of two persons deputed by themselves. These were the Heers Hugo Muis van Holy, schout of Dort, and Hugo Grotius, pensionary of Rotterdam. After a long examination of him, in relation to the contents of his book, the examiners professed to say that he had not given them satisfaction, and when he learned that they intended to make such a report to the States, he begged it, as a favour, that they would present to their high mightinesses the following statement of his sentiments on the chief point on which he had been charged with heterodoxy, that is, the Divinity of Christ; first, that he believed the Lord Jesus Christ is very God: secondly, that he is God from all eternity: and thirdly, that he existed before he was conceived and born of his virgin mother. This was promised to him, though Episcopius says that it was done in a very imperfect manner by Polyander, which induced Grotius, who felt that the representation of the professor had wronged Venator, afterward to present it more distinctly. Polyander, it appears, was determined to be the reporter of these proceedings, and acted an unfair part, for which he was subsequently charged with injustice and enmity toward Venator. The sequel was the banishment of this clergyman.

In this business Episcopius certainly felt the awkwardness of his situation, as is manifest from his attempts at one time to shield the man, and then subsequently allowing himself to go with the stream of prejudice against him. Hence, when Venator, the day following, presented a memorial to the States, containing a confession of his faith, which certainly must be deemed orthodox on the subject of Christ's Divinity,* Episcopius stated, in relation to it, "that if Venator had spoken so yesterday, or even had sooner delivered his opinion about the three before-mentioned points, he would have given better, nay, indeed, entire satisfaction; for, in his opinion, nothing more was wanting." However honourable this statement might be to Episcopius, in thus attempting to vindicate a man whom party feeling had condemned, yet we think he ought to have taken a more bold and decided part in his favour; the more especially, as he could but perceive, by the conduct of his colleague, what were his feelings toward those who made any approach to the liberal opinions of Arminius; and that the man who was so eager to urge on the ruin of this minister, to please his party, on account of the liberality of his views, would, when opportunity offered, which soon occurred, tender his vote in support of measures that would bring upon him a calamity similar to Venator's, that of being banished from his friends and his country.

---

* The reader will find this memorial in Brandt, vol. ii, p. 316.

In looking at the whole of this affair, we may, perhaps, have so far misunderstood the conduct of Episcopius in it as unjustly to have censured him. Be it so. One thing, however, will appear to the reader from the above remarks, that is, that we are not wilfully blind to the possibility of the subject of these memoirs being capable of defective conduct; and therefore assert that in what appears to us his truckling to the clamours of the High Calvinistic party, he was weakly striving to please men whom nothing could please but the banishment of those who could not go all their lengths in supporting the narrow and bigoted views which they had adopted. Of the truth of these sentiments, Episcopius' subsequent experience furnished him with ample and painful evidence.

During the stay of the two professors at the Hague they were summoned to the chamber of the States for the purpose of giving their opinion on a certain edict, which was being prepared, relative to ecclesiastical affairs. When they appeared in the chamber they found some gentlemen waiting for them, who were deputed, on the part of the States, first to read the edict to them, and then receive their judgment upon it. When Polyander, as senior professor, was asked for his opinion on the edict, he declined giving it, alleging that if he acted otherwise he might be doing injury to the rights of the Church, and subject himself to the displeasure of certain persons whom he did not wish to offend. At least, he said, it was certain that by doing it he should displease one party, and therefore he wished to be excused complying with the request of the States.

The true ground of Polyander's demur was this:—The States claimed a right to legislate on certain ecclesiastical matters, which was a source of great annoyance to the Calvinist clergy, inasmuch as they were fully aware that by their acting upon it all their hopes of excluding the Remonstrants and their opinions from the pulpit would be unavailing; for the States were, as is usually the case with lay legislative assemblies, more tolerant and less bigoted than the clergy. His refusal was therefore a manœuvre to get rid of acknowledging the right of the States, separate from the Church, to interfere in her affairs; and the more covertly to carry his point, he proposed that Uitenbogaerdt, who was in favour with the government, and Festus, should be associated as representatives of the Church in this business. Grotius, who was present, demurred at this proposal,—no such office having been created by the civil authorities.

Episcopius then stepped forward and said, "that as to himself he felt no difficulty in giving his opinion, for he considered that he was not only obliged so to do as a subject, but was likewise bound to do it from the fact of his being in the service of their high mightinesses, who were his sovereigns, and had the right to demand his counsel at any time they thought proper to require it; and in giving it he believed he was not prejudicing the interests of the Church, much less infringing on its rights and privileges." Polyander still refused to comply with the request of the States, when Episcopius said, "Gentlemen, I have no difficulty in the case, and shall be glad to give my opinion upon it."

The edict, it appears, related to the subject of preaching on the points in debate between the Remonstrants and the Contra-Remonstrants, and was designed to induce the ministers of both parties not to introduce them, or, at least, to discuss them with moderation, in their public ministrations. Vain was the attempt; as, indeed, are all such restrictive measures, when men are excited by religious controversy. The fact is, this edict made things worse than before, and proved the folly of legislating upon such subjects.

Episcopius, in giving his opinion in favour of the intended resolution, accompanied it with a request that it was to be understood that its recommended restrictions should not extend to the professors, inasmuch as in debating propositions in the universities a greater latitude ought to be allowed there than was requisite in the pulpit.

The facts just alluded to will show the reader the two points on which all the debates and strife of the Church of Holland hinged.* The one related to certain theological distinctions on the subject of predestination and its cognate doctrines. The other referred to Church policy;—the Calvinist party claiming the right of adjusting all ecclesiastical affairs, and especially the liberty of deposing what they called heretical preachers, without the interference and check of the magistrate. To gain this, they were prepared to go to any lengths. Prince Maurice saw this, and, like a good diplomatist, knew how to seize hold of the current of affairs to effect his own purpose. Before this period the Calvinist clergy and he were opponents, because, like his good father, he checked them in their bigotry and persecuting proceedings. Now they became friends; and if there was not a declared compact between them, yet they worked together under that silent and unexpressed sympathy which prompts persons engaged in kindred pursuits instinctively and reciprocally to help each other in the accomplishment of their purposes. He was to receive help from the Contra-Remonstrants in seizing hold of the reins of government, for which he was to sacrifice his former friends, and give them over into the hands of these their bigoted enemies; while they were to enjoy the right of setting up their standard of orthodoxy, and of deposing from their ministry and banishing those clergymen who could not concur with them in every point of doctrine. In this way they intended to clear the Church of heresy, and firmly establish, in all her borders, what they denominated the truth, that is to say, Calvinism.

---

* In their political character, Arminianism and Calvinism, at this period, took opposite ground, in Holland and in England. In Holland, Arminianism was on the side of freedom, and Barneveldt and Grotius resisted the despotic designs of Maurice, while the Calvinists supported him. In England, the latter were opposed to despotism, and the Arminians were in favour of it. Of course the opposite effects followed to each party. In Holland, the Calvinists were protected, and the Arminians oppressed; in England, the Calvinists were oppressed, and the Arminians protected; which led Bishop Morley, when asked by a grave gentleman, what the Arminians held, pleasantly to reply, "They hold all the best bishoprics and deaneries in England."—See *John Hampden's Life by Lord Nugent.*

The period of which we are now writing, Maurice, it appears, thought was not the most suitable for the accomplishment of his purpose, and therefore, with the policy of the statesman and courtier, we find him endeavouring to amuse the Remonstrants; and when Episcopius, in the following August, was invited by the magistrates and consistory of the Hague to preach there, he took care to let it be known that he was anxious to see him, and show his esteem for so distinguished a man and celebrated a scholar. The latter, during his stay at the Hague, was invited, with Uitenbogaerdt, to dine with the Heer Vander Myle, son-in-law to the lord advocate, Barneveldt.

This gentlemen, who was in the secret, stated, while Episcopius was seated at his table, that he had heard from his excellency, Prince Henry, that his brother, Prince Maurice, had said to him, he had been informed of Episcopius having preached at the Hague, a circumstance, he declared, with which he was highly pleased; and added, that he understood him to be a very amiable and peaceable man, and not to have written on the controversy. Besides, he said, it has been told me that he is a man of extraordinary powers, and of a highly cultivated mind, and it would afford me great pleasure to have an interview with him, seeing that it is possible he may be able to suggest some means that will tend, if not to put an end to, yet at least to allay, the present dissensions—an event greatly desired by me, inasmuch as they prevent me from the enjoyment of rest and peace both night and day.

Prince Henry, it was also stated, had said to this same gentleman, that his brother would be happy to send for Episcopius, but that he was apprehensive that by so doing he should excite the displeasure of the more bigoted of the

Contra-Remonstrant party. As difficulties therefore arose in the way, it was proposed to take the advice of Barneveldt, who gave it as his decided opinion, that Episcopius should endeavour to obtain an audience of Prince Maurice. He was then asked in what way it could be done; he answered, "In the way of paying his respects to the prince; and on which occasion he should say that he was anxious not to return to Leyden without showing his profound respect to his excellency; and especially recommending the university of Leyden to his notice and gracious regard."

Still there appeared to be insuperable obstacles in the way; and it was finally determined that Prince Henry should be consulted personally, as to the propriety of Episcopius attempting to be introduced to his brother; and Uitenbogaerdt, with Episcopius, at the suggestion of Vander Myle, waited upon him for that purpose. When they arrived at the residence of the prince, he was not within. They then waited upon the princess dowager, his mother, and made her acquainted with the object of their visit. This lady, pleased with the proposal, for she was warmly attached to the cause of the Remonstrants,* said that she had herself heard Prince Maurice speak of Episcopius in the strongest terms of approbation; and she stated that immediately after midday she should be able to inform them when her son, Prince Henry, would be within, that they might wait upon him for the purpose of speaking to him.

---

* This princess was the daughter of the celebrated Coligny, the great admiral of France, whose fatal end, at the massacre on Bartholomew's eve, every reader well knows. Her commanding talents, which she inherited from her gifted father, she used in favour of the Remonstrants, and adopted every means within her power to allay the religious dissensions of Holland. Among others, she joined with several distinguished men of the Netherlands in entreating the celebrated Du Plessis, a French Protestant nobleman, who at that period was as renowned for his prudence as a statesman, as for his courage as a soldier, and his piety as a Christian, to visit the United Provinces, that by his influence and talents he would endeavour to compose the dissensions of the Belgians. In her letter to him from the Hague, dated December 28th, 1617, she says, "It is certain, sir, that we stand in the utmost need of your wise and prudent counsels, and I verily believe that the one party, as well as the other, will hearken more to yours than to those of any other person. Sir, it is not only about religion that our quarrels are; our country is likewise at stake, if some care be not speedily taken. You are one of those who assisted my lord and husband to lay the foundations of this state: come now to the help of his children, and keep them from burying themselves in its ruins. If the dead had any knowledge of what passes upon the earth, I am sure he would conjure you to it in his own name and by his ashes. Sir, I

At three o'clock she sent her page to say that the prince was prepared to see them. This amiable gentleman received them in the most friendly manner; and when made acquainted with their intention, he gave it as his decided opinion that Episcopius should wait upon his brother, as-

---

beg it of you most heartily; for God's sake, do not stand upon punctilios."

But while Du Plessis would have readily concurred with the entreaties of this lady and other distinguished persons, had there been any hope of success attending such a proposed measure, yet he clearly saw that all his efforts would be useless, saying in reply, "that the disease was violent, and that it was too late to apply any remedy."

Of the descendants of this distinguished man, after the revocation of the edict of Nantes by the tyranny of Louis 14th, nothing is heard in the history of France. The reason for this is the fact of their being among those who, with several other French families, emigrated in 1685 and 1686 to the Cape of Good Hope, where their descendants continue. In proof of this, the following fact is stated in a work published at the Cape of Good Hope in the year 1827, with the following title: *A Fragment of Church History at the Cape of Good Hope.*

"When General Janssens was governor of the Cape, a despatch arrived from France, containing a request of an extraordinary nature:—it was to find out the family of Du Plessis, and to request a senior member of it to proceed to France, in order to take possession of family estates and a dukedom, for some time extinct for want of a lineal descendant. The governor of the Cape instantly forwarded the communication to Mr. Vander Riet, the landdrost of Stellenbosch, who waited on Mr. Du Plessis, a farmer in the district. The old gentleman heard the proposition unmoved, rejected it, and avowed his attachment to Africa, and rural life.

"There is every reason to believe that Bonaparte had some sinister purposes to serve, in thus endeavouring to bring Du Plessis to France. Bonaparte was just then created consul for life, and might probably wish to gratify the Protestant interest, and show his abhorrence of persecution.

"The Du Plesses of this colony are descendants of Mornay Du Plessis, a Protestant nobleman, who united in his character the best qualities of the soldier, the statesman, the scholar, and the Christian. He is celebrated for being the friend and correspondent of Andrew Melville, the illustrious Scottish reformer."

serting "that he had no doubt but that his excellency, Prince Maurice, would not only be pleased, but was really desirous of seeing him." They then asked him what should be the assigned reason for soliciting an audience of the prince: he answered, as the Heer Vander Myle had done before, "to pay his respects to him," adding, at the same time, "that he believed his brother was anxious to ascertain whether he could devise any means to put an end to the present dissensions in the Church; or present in writing to him some plan by which it might be effected." They replied, "they had already used, on their part, every possible method to effect an accommodation with the opposite party, and that nothing more could be thought of by them than that of mutual forbearance and toleration." "I know that," answered the prince, "nevertheless an interview with his excellency can do no harm." Still Episcopius hesitated, and again he and Uitenbogaerdt waited upon Barneveldt, to have his farther judgment upon the business. This gentleman urged them by all means to follow the counsel of Prince Henry, informing Episcopius that his excellency had imagined, and was strongly impressed with the idea, that the Remonstrants designed to supplant, and indeed, if possible, to overthrow the Contra-Remonstrants. Barneveldt undoubtedly meant by this to intimate to Episcopius that he should, if a favourable opportunity occurred, seize hold of it for the purpose of removing such an impression.

The following day Episcopius waited upon his excellency, who received him in the most friendly way, giving him his hand, and in a kind and affable manner said, "that it afforded him great pleasure to see him, and that he had long wished to have an interview with him." Episcopius in reply said, "that he felt it to be his duty not to return till he had kissed the hand of his excellency," who thanked him. Episcopius, while thus addressing him, was uncovered; the prince bade him put on his hat, saying "that he was not accustomed to speak with persons uncovered;" and added farther, "that he was anxious to speak with him on those unhappy dissensions in religion, and to learn from him what were his views concerning them; and to ascertain whether he knew of any mode that could be adopted by which the calamities resulting from them could be removed. Some people," said he, "suspect me of having some other design, and that I take one side, and am labouring to suppress the other. This, I assure you, is far from me; but, on the contrary, I am anxious equally to defend both parties: nevertheless, I deem it right to say that I have a preference for those who adhere to the old religion."

Thus far, says Limborch, I have found an account of this interview given in the notes of Episcopius; the subsequent matters introduced on the occasion he has not stated; I therefore am unable to give any farther account of his conference with Prince Maurice.

It may perhaps be deemed illiberal to doubt* the sincerity of Maurice's statements, as to his intentions of equally protecting both parties, and we should concur with the sentiment did not his subsequent conduct contradict his statements to Episcopius. He certainly had fixed his purpose of accomplishing "some other design" as soon as he saw affairs ripe for it; and as the Arminian party, at the head of which were Barneveldt and Grotius, had opposed his "design," he determined upon their ruin, the particulars of which will be stated in the following pages.

In the fall of these great men it was not to be expected that those immediately connected with them could escape; and Uitenbogaerdt, the intimate friend of the lord advocate, was of course not to pass without feeling the effects of the convulsion that was just at hand. It is true, Uitenbogaerdt was Maurice's chaplain, and had been admitted to his confidence and friendship; but all the claims of friendship give way before those of ambition and the dictates of political rancour; and therefore among the victims doomed to suffer, this venerable clergyman was marked out as one. This he clearly foresaw; and having long been weary of the dissensions that agitated the Church, and disgusted with the bigotry of the opposite party, especially when his comparatively juvenile colleague was patronized even by Maurice himself, in separating from him as a heretic, with whom communion could not be held with safety, he petitioned the magistrates and consistory of Leyden to release him from his obligation to act as pastor of the Walloon Church. In the first instance they strenuously opposed his request, and, at length, complied with it only on this condition, that he should occasionally preach among them.

---

* How far we are correct in our doubts as to Maurice's sincerity, in his declared intention of equally protecting both parties, will be seen from the fact of his having asserted in the latter end of this year, "that the disputes could not be settled but by the force of arms:" and in the following year, when Barneveldt, Grotius, and other gentlemen in the assembly of the States, openly advocated mutual toleration, he would strike his hand upon his sword, and say, "It is not by many splendid orations and embellished speeches that these matters are to be settled, but with this will I defend the religion which my noble father planted and fostered in this land, without suffering any change therein, and let him who dares, attempt to oppose me in this work."—*Uitenbog. Kerkl. Hist.* bl. 814, as quoted in *Regenboog's Historie der Remonstranten erste deel.* bl. 261.

Immediately after, matters grew still more gloomy, and the Contra-Remonstrants were violent beyond all bounds. The government had lost all authority, because Maurice showed himself in favour of those who opposed the States, forbidding the soldiers, who were at his beck, to suppress the riotous proceedings of the Calvinist party; and to complete his purpose, he proceeded by violence to change the magistrates in several cities; and finally to accomplish his "some other design," he decoyed Barneveldt into his power, whom he ordered, in opposition to all law or justice, to be imprisoned with Hoogerbeets, pensionary of Leyden, and Grotius, pensionary of Rotterdam. Uitenbogaerdt, as noticed above, was to have been the next victim, but he happily saw the gathering storm, and retired to Brabant, out of the reach of the wicked grasp of this successful and aspiring soldier.*

So highly esteemed was this venerable clergyman by the princess dowager of Orange, and her amiable son, Prince Frederick Henry, that they caused it to be intimated to him not to return to Holland, though his safety should be guarantied by a government document. This lady, it appears, too well knew the designs of Maurice and his creatures upon this distinguished minister, to allow him to be lured into their toils by any stratagem they might devise for that purpose.*

---

* Maurice, the eldest Protestant son of William, surpassed his father in military genius, but fell short of him in that moderation of temper and principle which is a most indispensable virtue in the leader of a free state. The blood of Barneveldt and the dungeon of Grotius have left an indelible stain on his memory.—*History of the Revolution of England in* 1688, by the late SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH.

The loss of Uitenbogaerdt's labours in the pulpit was severely felt by those who were attached to his ministry; and the magistrates and consistory of the Hague, wishing to supply the lack of his services, requested several ministers to officiate successively in the pulpit he had formerly occupied. Among these Episcopius was earnestly solicited occasionally to preach among them. To this he readily consented, and on the 16th of September delivered a sermon in the great church, from the following words: *Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled,* Matt. v, 6. This discourse, it appears, gave great offence to some of the bigoted Contra-Remonstrant party, who carried their animosity so far against the preacher as formally to complain of him to the States of Holland. This circumstance induced the States to send the following letter to the consistory at the Hague:—

"Learned, Pious, Beloved, and Eminent,—In consequence of its having been stated to us, that on Sunday last the professor and minister, Episcopius, when preaching in the great church at the Hague, did, in his sermon, introduce certain matters more calculated to excite sedition than to promote the edification of the congregation, which was an occasion of offence to many of the pious hearers; we have therefore judged it right to send these presents to you, and hereby to request that you will, at the earliest opportunity, make inquiry, and inform us of this affair as speedily as possible, which we shall accordingly expect of you; and we commend you to the care of God. Written at the Hague, September the eighteenth, 1618. By order of the States.

"Undersigned—A. DUYCK."

"The answer of the consistory to the States," says Limborch, "I have never been able to procure, but the testimony its members gave to Episcopius in relation to this sermon is as follows:—

"Since Dr. Episcopius, professor of theology in the university of Leyden, did, at the earnest request of the consistory and some other members of the congregation of the Hague, preach on the 16th of September last; and as it appears that some persons of the said congregation have complained of his sermon delivered on that occasion to certain distinguished and illustrious persons, stating that the said Episcopius had therein made use of certain improper and unjustifiable statements, tending more to generate sedition than to promote the edification and instruction of the congregation, and that in consequence of such a representation to their high mightinesses, the States of Holland and West Friesland, they have been induced to write to the consistory of the said Church, to the end that it might inform their high mightinesses of the real state and truth of the matter; and because this circumstance has come to the knowledge of the aforesaid professor, who has requested our judgment on the sermon, we therefore, the undersigned ministers, elders, and deacons, representing the said consistory, have declared, and do declare, unanimously, as well as several members of the Church who heard the aforesaid sermon, our most perfect and entire approbation of the same; and not only so, but likewise of the prayers that preceded and followed the sermon; and do aver that not one word was uttered that was objectionable or capable of giving offence, but on the contrary we do declare, concerning the said prayers and sermon, and especially the latter, that they contained doctrines, exhortations, and reproofs, which were very pious and highly calculated to promote the instruction of those who heard them, and most worthy to be received as tending to promote their holiness and salvation. Given in the consistory of the Hague, 20th of September, 1618. Signed, Bernardus La Faille and John Taurenus, ministers of the Hague; Quirin Van Stryen, J. Van Duynen, Francis Criep, John Janson Cocq, N. Van Sorgen, elders."*

---

* See *Brandt*, vol. ii, p. 551.

---

* This discourse is to be found in the folio edition of Episcopius' sermons, at page 331. To prove that the charges advanced by those bigots were unfounded, we have only to state that it was not composed for the occasion, but is one of a course of sermons he was preaching on the beatitudes. The fact is, that the complainants, by their clamour having hunted down Uitenbogaerdt, were deeply mortified that his place was not supplied by a Contra-Re-

We must now resume that part of our narrative which especially relates to the conduct of Maurice in his attempts to secure the absolute sovereignty of the Netherlands. In accomplishing his purpose, he knew that his success wholly depended on the consent of Barneveldt. To induce him to comply with his design, he had recourse to the dowager princess of Orange, his mother-in-law.

Aware that the gentle character and exemplary conduct of this lady had procured her universal esteem, Maurice calculated upon her influence with Barneveldt; and to succeed the more effectually, he told her that he had positively determined to remain unmarried, and in this way would prepare the way for her own son, Prince Henry, to succeed him in his intended sovereignty. The princess,* not insensible to this appeal, followed the instructions of Maurice, and broached the affair to Barneveldt, but he was inexorable. He clearly explained to her the perilous career on which the prince proposed to enter. He showed how great, how independent, yea, how almost absolute he might continue, without shocking the principles of the Dutch States, by grasping at an empty dignity, which could not virtually increase his authority. The princess, convinced by his reasoning, repaired to Maurice; but, instead of finding him as ready a convert as she herself had been, she received as cold an answer as was compatible with a passionate temper, wounded pride, and disappointed ambition.†

The conduct of Barneveldt in this affair sealed his doom in the mind of Maurice. He now threw off all disguise, attached himself openly to the Calvinist party, and made use of the name of religion to accomplish his designs. In doing this, it seemed absolutely necessary to crush

---

monstrant minister, and therefore vented their spleen in the manner as shown above.

* "Louisa de Coligny was a woman singular in her character, as well as in her destiny, who, having seen her father and the husband of her youth murdered, was doomed to witness the fall of a more illustrious husband by the hand of an assassin of the same faction, and who, in her last widowhood, earned the affection of William's children so as to insure their protection to a son whom she inspired with her own virtues."—*Mackintosh's History of the Revolution in England, in* 1688, p. 307.

† See *Grattan's Netherlands.*

Arminianism; and all his minor measures were subservient to this grand object, inasmuch as its abettors stood identified with the patriot party.*

A national synod was now loudly called for by the Gomarists, and, in spite of the constitutional opposition offered to it, was formally proclaimed. This the nobles of Holland and Utrecht complained of, saying that it was unlawful for a few of the minor States to appoint any thing in these matters without the consent of the principal States. This exasperated the Calvinist party, the violence of whose proceedings knew no bounds.

The Latin editor of Episcopius' memoirs very justly remarks, "The States of Holland, which had foreseen the results of calling a national synod, had long resisted such a measure, but had proposed the appointment of a provincial one, to which deputies from neighbouring States were to be invited. That they had the right of making such a proposal must be admitted from the principles of the confederacy of Utrecht, formed in 1579, which guarantied a species of separate sovereignty to each of the seven provinces, which, in truth, were seven distinct communities, each having the right of regulating its own local affairs, especially those relating to religion. The comparative importance of Holland may be estimated from the consideration that, in general assessments of money, that province raised much more than half of the sum levied on the whole confederacy.† Not being able, however, to succeed in securing the appointment of such a provincial synod, they declared on the 10th of February, 1618, that they were willing that the matters relating to these contentions should be debated in council by men of peace, and that some rule of interpretation of the formularies of the Church should be contrived, for the purpose of preventing an incorrect exposition of them, and regulating their use as a standard of address to the people, and which might be so expressed as not to be burdensome to the persons who could not entirely concur with it in all its parts. In a subsequent resolution of the States, published in the month of August of the same year, the same declaration was made, in which the subject of calling a synod of Holland was considered, for devising means to restore peace, and it was farther added that, if, after its sittings, any points should be found which required to be decided upon, the decision of them should be put off by this provincial synod to a national synod, which might take cognizance of the same, and decide according to the word of God, not only upon their truth, but also their importance. And the States of Holland declared that they were ready to contribute what might be found necessary for the execution of the same.

---

* Idem.

† Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History, by Dr. Miller, vol. v, p. 486.

"In the meantime Maurice was intent upon his object, and pretended that the diversity of opinion in the States was a warrant for him to disregard their decrees, and, therefore, in despite of the States, forbade the soldiers, as before stated, to attend to their commands. But the lords, knowing that the soldiers owed obedience to them, and seeing that Maurice thus unconstitutionally forbade them receiving the commands of their sovereigns, gave the guardianship of the towns and places of defence to the national militia, called Waardegelders. In this juncture of affairs, the magistrates, likewise, of various towns where there were either no regular soldiers, or where they were suspected, did, with the permission of the States of Holland, organize and increase the city militia at their own expense, according to a right which they possessed, and which they had before used, of arming for the protection of the public peace,—the lawfulness of which had never been questioned by the States. This, however, Maurice asserted, was prejudicial to his authority, and pretended to take huge offence at it. Certainly it was the way to thwart his designs, and that he knew, and, therefore, while the Calvinistic party were violent in their clamours for a national synod, he was determined to use this circumstance for the accomplishment of his purpose. How far he might depend on the assistance of this party, will be seen from the fact of the consistory of Brille, who, though according to their profession as ministers of the Gospel, were bound not to use any weapons in their *warfare that were carnal*, had, nevertheless, in a public document they presented to the magistrates, against whom they were in a state of rebellion, gone so far as to say, *that they would try whose fists were the hardest.* This induced the latter, while witnessing the irregularities occasioned by the proceedings of the clergy, to embody the Waardegelders, in order to secure the public peace. Maurice, who was alive to these measures, was fully aware that if this were allowed it would prevent the execution of his designs, and, knowing that he should be supported by the consistory, set out suddenly by night from the Hague, and arrived at the Brille, and, in direct opposition to the entreaties and remonstrances of the magistrates, and in violation of the rights of the town, placed some of the soldiers devoted to his person in that important place, which was the key of Holland; and in this way this ambitious soldier, already in the enjoyment of all but absolute power, proclaimed himself supreme master of the States. Nothing could now withstand the accomplishment of the object of his wishes, and that of the party to which he had attached himself. At Utrecht he disbanded the Waardegelders, a minute account of which is given by Brandt, who states that he is thus particular in his narrative, because of the great consequences arising out of these proceedings to the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of Holland. The fact was, it prepared the way for Maurice to change the magistracy, and to summon his creatures to his aid, who became his instruments in accomplishing his dark designs upon Barneveldt, and proscribing the Arminian party, of which he was the principal lay leader. In this state of animosity against the Remonstrants, the Calvinistic party, with Maurice at their head, carried their measures in obtaining the appointment of a national synod." The reader will concur with the statement of the Latin editor of Limborch's memoirs of Episcopius, that it was not difficult to see to which side the victory would be awarded.

The 13th of November, 1618, was the day on which the first session of this celebrated synod was held. During its sittings, which continued for near six months, its members procured the condemnation of Arminianism, and prepared the way for the deposition of those ministers who espoused it, and the imprisonment of their persons, with the banishment of hundreds of pious, industrious, respectable, and peaceable families, who formed the body of their congregations and flocks: nevertheless, the president could say to its members, at the opening of its hundred and fifty-fourth sitting, when reviewing these and similar acts, "that the miraculous labours of the synod had made hell to tremble." Before, however, we proceed to the particular history of this famous assembly, whose proceedings were so alarming to the rulers of the nether regions, we must follow the statements of Limborch in his details of what passed before its sittings commenced. Provincial synods, he says, were convoked through all the provinces, where all things were to be arranged for the national synod, and letters of citation were issued to the parties concerned.

The Remonstrants, who were present at the conference of the Hague, about this time presented to the States of Holland a memorial, in which they showed the conditions under which a national synod should be appointed. On the 20th of September the States sent a letter to the above Remonstrants, the contents of which were as follow:—

"Learned, Beloved, and Particular,—After the memorial presented by you to our assembly had been examined, and the contents and request of the same duly weighed, it has been deemed proper that the said memorial should be taken by our deputies to the synods of North and South Holland, in order that it may be there presented and carefully examined in the fear of the Lord, and that a decision be pronounced upon it without prejudice or partiality, in accordance with the well-being of the Church, the prosperity of the State, and, as far as possible, to your satisfaction; and this our letter is to be held by you as a notice of the same. Moreover, we advise, admonish, and command you, to send your deputies, according to the decisions of the synodical classis, to the synods of North and South Holland, respectively to be held at Delft and Enchusa on the 8th and 10th of October next. And, because it is fit and proper that those who shall appear in your name at these synods should be free and safe, we, by these presents, assure them of the same. Do not, therefore, omit attending to this order; and, expecting you to comply with the same, we commend you to the protection of almighty God. Written at the Hague, September 20th, 1618.

"Signed by order of the States, A. DUYCK."

About the same time, letters of invitation for holding a national synod at Dort, were sent from the lords, the States-General, to the princes and magistrates of the reformed provinces, requesting them to send learned theologians to the synod to be held on the 1st of November. The professors also of the universities belonging to their high mightinesses were invited. The letter sent to Episcopius runs thus:—

"The States of Holland and West Friesland:—

"Most Learned, Beloved, and Particular,—Since the high and mighty lords, the States-General of the United Netherlands, in order to remove the sorrowful religious dissensions of their country, have judged it proper to summon in the United Netherland provinces, a national synod, to be held in the city of Dort about the 1st day of November next, in the presence of some pious, learned, peaceable, and moderate persons, who may be assembled from the neighbouring kingdoms, provinces, and States, by their high mightinesses, which we have no doubt but you have already understood; so these presents are designed to notify to you, and thereby to remind, require, and command you, suitably to prepare to appear without fail at the city of Dort, on the 1st of November, in order to be present and assist at the aforesaid national synod with good counsel and advice. Depending, therefore, upon your compliance with these directions, we commend you to the protection of almighty God. Written at the Hague, 20th of September, 1618.

"By order of the States. Signed, A. DUYCK."

In the meantime provincial synods were held in various parts of the Netherlands, but the arrangements there made were greatly detrimental to the Remonstrants, and they clearly foresaw what would be the effects of them in the approaching national synod. In order that the Contra-Remonstrants might have the largest number of votes in the provincial synods, those classes in which they were in the minority they, by force or art, divided, and each division sent its deputies to the synod. But in those classes in which they were the larger number, they would not suffer any such division. From this it must necessarily follow, that the Remonstrants would have the smallest number of votes in the synod. In the letters of citation the Remonstrants were not addressed as brethren.* The Contra-Remonstrants also disputed the authority of the letters by which the Remonstrants were authorized to attend these provincial synods, for the purpose of excluding them; and under various pretexts and subterfuges disqualified others from attending them; and by this nefarious mode of proceeding they prepared the way to choose such deputies for the national synod as they desired, taking care that they should all be Contra-Remonstrants, and thereby exclude the Remonstrants. In several instances where the latter had been deputed from their classes, they, without any just cause, and without waiting the judgment of the national synod, suspended them from their office; and under various pretences, deposed several others of their most eminent ministers, for the purpose of preventing the Remonstrants from having the benefit of their influence and talents in the approaching national synod. As the reader may suppose, the celebrated and amiable Uitenbogaerdt would not be allowed to appear in that assembly; they, therefore, under certain pretexts, excluded him from the ministry, as also Nicholas Grevinchovius, preacher of Rotterdam, another of the most eminent of the Remonstrant clergy. In the whole province of Utrecht there were only five Contra-Remonstrant ministers; nevertheless, the party to which they belonged so managed their affairs, as actually to secure to them the power of forming themselves into a special synod, distinct from the Remonstrants, that they might thus be able to depute two from their number to the national synod, one of whom however was not a Hollander, but a stranger who was officiating for the time being among them. The synod of the Remonstrants of this province also deputed two persons to the national synod, but when it came to treat of the subjects relating to the Remonstrants, even they were excluded from it, as will be noticed hereafter.

---

* Much must be allowed for the excitement of the moment when judging of the conduct and spirit of the Contra-Remonstrant clergy at this period. Nevertheless, it will be admitted that they were not *very* impartial and unprejudiced judges on the questions in debate between them and the opposite party, when it is known that at several of the provincial synods, when they were about to enter on the business for which they were assembled, the most violent of these ministers declared in several instances, in the name of their respective classes, *that they could not own the Remonstrants as brethren in Christ, but on the contrary held them for* HEATHENS *and* PUBLICANS.

About this time it was that Festus published his book entitled, "*Specimen Belgicarum Controversiarum;*—A Specimen of the Controversies of the Low Countries." This book, which was composed with the special design of injuring the cause of the Remonstrants, by prejudicing the foreign divines against them, abounded with misrepresentations, and dealt largely in the dishonourable practice of first creating false opinions, and then attributing them to the Remonstrants. Not satisfied with thus endeavouring to prejudice the foreign members of the synod, it was likewise translated into Dutch under this offensive title: "*Monster der Nederlandsche geschillen;*—The Monster of the Low Country differences." This was designed to act upon the mob, whom Festus knew so well how to manage, and to win them over to the Contra-Remonstrant cause. Of these nefarious proceedings the Remonstrants complained most bitterly; and to show that they had just grounds for these complaints, Episcopius published a small tract, to which we alluded at page 165, entitled, *Optima Fides Festi Hommii*, in which he showed that Festus had misrepresented his theses in the most palpable manner. To vindicate himself against this charge, Festus pretended to give the private disputations of Episcopius. These he had obtained in the dishonourable manner mentioned at page 164. He prefixed to this publication a preface, in which he endeavoured to defend himself from the charges alleged against him by Episcopius. But this work, pretending to give a representation of our professor's sentiments, was so faulty, stupid, and gross, that Episcopius, in a second pamphlet, clearly demonstrated that if Festus had not acted with great duplicity and bad faith, yet, at least, he had shown that degree of carelessness which could not be reconciled with honourable principles and the sanctity of the ministerial office. I have, says Limborch, the identical copy of Episcopius' theses, written in his own hand, and presented by him to some of his students, for the purpose of its being collated with those published by Festus, and pretending to be his. On the margin of this manuscript are written the misstatements and false quotations of Festus, which, even from the beginning to the end, are so many, and so gross, that it cannot be read without surprise and disgust. Whoever would take the trouble to compare those contained in Festus' publication with those of Episcopius, printed in the second volume of his works, will be convinced for himself of the justice of these remarks.

The period now rapidly approached for the assembling of the Synod of Dort, and the necessary preliminary arrangements were made to facilitate the business for which it had been convoked. The foreign theologians daily arrived, who presented the letters with which they were furnished, authorizing them to appear in the synod. In the meantime, however, and before the foreign divines had all arrived, the officers for the synod were elected by the provincial members. The president was John Bogerman, minister of Leowarden; the assessors were James Roelandus and Herman Faukelius, ministers of Amsterdam and Middleburg; and the secretaries Festus Hommius and Sebastian Damman, ministers of Leyden and Zutphen. From such an election, says Limborch, the Remonstrants at once saw what was to be their fate; as these men, who were thus chosen to be the great agents and instruments in managing the business of the synod, were their most bitter, unrelenting, and bigoted enemies and persecutors.

The time being now arrived for Episcopius to hasten to the Synod of Dort, according to the summons of their high mightinesses, the States of Holland, in which he was directed to repair to Dort, in his character of professor of theology, to assist with his counsel in that venerable assembly, he deemed it right, on the thirteenth of November, to address the students under his care; and, as he evidently foresaw it would be for the last time, instead of pursuing the course he had marked out for himself in his usual college lectures, he delivered to them a brief oration in the form of a farewell address, containing a summary account of his proceedings, his mode of instruction, and the motives by which he was prompted in so doing. Fully aware that his attachment to the opinions he had espoused was about to be tried, he herein declares his readiness to suffer for the same; the correctness of which declaration the subsequent parts of these memoirs will place beyond the shadow of a doubt. This oration is singularly marked by its pointed sentiments, elevated piety, and courageous bearing, as well as with the statement of errors in doctrine which prevailed in the Dutch Church, and the defective mode of teaching in the public seats of learning, which render it worthy of notice; and therefore we deem it right to give it a place in these memoirs.

AN ORATION,

DELIVERED BY SIMON EPISCOPIUS WHEN HE WAS ABOUT TO LEAVE THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN, TO ATTEND THE SYNOD OF DORT, TO WHICH HE HAD BEEN SUMMONED.

"In our lecture of yesterday, we brought to a close our observations on the signs which our holy Redeemer declared should precede his last and glorious advent. It now remains that we should proceed to a description of this grand and awfully sublime, but ardently desired scene itself. And, indeed, had I been permitted to have accomplished my purpose, I had designed, before I ended my remarks, to have gone through this subject in all its parts. For there is nothing the consideration and recollection of which can or ought to be more agreeable and acceptable to a devout mind than the anticipation of that most glorious and eventful day. But because I am constrained to be occupied by other cares and engagements, I have deemed it proper not to commence an exposition which I should not be able to bring to a close; and therefore my lectures, which have been continued to the twenty-sixth chapter,* must for the present terminate. The consideration of this subject, however, may probably be undertaken at a subsequent period. And now, my very dear hearers, since I am compelled to desist from continuing my readings to you, on the great and dreadful day, when the Son of man shall appear in the clouds of heaven, with the glory of his Father, and shall pronounce an irrevocable sentence upon the thoughts, the words, and the deeds of all the human family; and as I am about to be absent from you for a short time, to defend myself and the cause of Jesus Christ, I can but take this opportunity of addressing you from this place. Bear with me, then, while for a little, and perhaps the last time, I may address you—you, I say, who have known all my ways in the Lord.

---

* This refers to his comment on St. Matthew's Gospel, which is to be found in the second volume of his works.

"Since I have sustained the office of public professor in this university, I solemnly declare that it has been my sole business not to endeavour to please men, for if I had I should not have been the servant of Jesus Christ, but, on the contrary, so to conduct myself that I might be found guiltless before the Son of man, and receive from my Lord Jesus Christ his approving testimony, that I have uprightly discharged the duties of my office, and been faithful in my ministry. And in order that I might, also, excite and stimulate you, by my instructions and example, to run the same course, and attain the same end, I have, as far as was in my power, laboured to prompt you to endeavour to become fellow partakers of the same glorious prize; and, at least, if I failed in this attempt, I might be clear of the guilt of your souls, and that your blood might not be required at my hands. This was the object of all my studies, counsels, and cares, and the proposed end of my professional duties and labours. What I have done in order to the accomplishment of my purposes suffer me now briefly to relate to you.

"In the sickly constituted body of our Church I saw that its diseased functions required no slight remedies to produce an effectual cure. But to attempt this was seen to be a perilous experiment, inasmuch as it was to be apprehended that the application of these remedies might tend powerfully to excite all the latent distempered humours of the system, and occasion certain fearful paroxysms, and fatal indications of approaching dissolution. It was necessary, therefore, to adopt one of these alternatives: either to abandon the diseased body, and suffer its maladies to become more and more aggravated, or to administer the necessary remedies, and attempt its restoration, rather than silently witness its inevitable dissolution. Arguments and reasons were not wanting in favour of either of these measures. These I deliberately examined and carefully weighed; and finally judged that I was bound to take the latter course, though involving the greatest risk, and to attempt the application of a remedy, should it expose me to the opposition and displeasure of the whole world. And in order that I might be able to effect my purpose, I judged that three very important and salutary measures must be adopted.

"The first was, that I should present the truths and subjects contained in the Scripture as plainly, clearly, and ingenuously, as I possibly could; not arrayed in false ornaments, borrowed colourings, and artificial representations. For I judged it of importance that he who wishes to learn the truth in order to teach it to others, should be able to follow its track, as though he bore the sun itself in his hand to illuminate his path. This I deemed the more necessary, because I saw that the import of many subjects,—and these the most weighty of the Scripture itself,—was represented in such a manner, through the inventive arts of some, the laboured and artificially wrought phrases of others, and the fanciful and formal arrangements of the *loci-communes*, or common-place divinity, that the meaning of the same is rendered so complicated, intricate, and perplexed, as to require the assistance of an Œdipus to solve and unfold some of these dark theological enigmas.* But so it is, my beloved auditors; and here was to me the first occasion of grief and inquietude. This barbarous and far-fetched phraseology rendered obscure and unintelligible any art or science, otherwise not difficult to be apprehended. And it has happened that those who have been forced to adopt and use such phrases, although they have been anxious and wholly intent upon acquiring a knowledge of some particular art or science, yet immediately, on making the attempt, they have been disgusted, and retraced their steps, though they would otherwise have been won to the pursuit of it, had it been allowed to appear in all its native simplicity and beauty. This I have also thought to be one of the greatest evils in theology. And it has been a source of great grief and pain to me, when I have witnessed an ardent, docile, and highly gifted youth, capable of attaining great eminence, wasting his time and talents upon studies that end only in the acquisition of an unintelligible and fruitless jargon of words, which, perpetually increasing like a swelling torrent, bears him away, as within the attraction of some mighty whirlpool, till he is in danger of being completely ingulfed, while the result of all this labour is the mere acquisition of terms, phrases, or opinions, instead of real knowledge.* And when I perceived that those who pursued such a course were found to have grasped at the illusive shadow of Juno,* instead of her person, I therefore judged that I ought to attempt to restore the simple phraseology of the apostles, which is so easy to be understood by every one, and to avoid the use of all philosophical speculations and logical terms, invented by the schools, and adopted as peculiarly belonging to academies and universities. An oration will produce more effect when delivered in unadorned and simple language, than when arrayed in the ornaments of a false and pompous style. This has been the reason of my never leading any one of you, requested or unrequested, to any other than the fountains of sacred truth, and never having counselled any one to read the *loci-communes*, until he had first very carefully consulted the Scriptures, in order that he might be made acquainted with their truths, and be furnished with sound and correct views of the same; lest bringing a prejudiced mind to the reading of the holy records, he should, as is commonly the case, interpret them according to the notions which he had previously heard and imbibed in the schools. Nevertheless, because the import of many subjects, contained here and there in Divine revelation, is veiled under metaphors and figures, and the meaning of others is hidden under representations and predictions, which can only be dug up and drawn out, as from the deep well of Democritus; and since all truths are not to be considered of equal importance, so I have deemed it necessary to produce, and direct your attention chiefly to those which are the most essential. In the meantime, however, I have, as far as was within my power, attempted to illustrate other passages of holy writ, the interpretation of which might contribute to the better understanding of the more weighty and important truths of theology. And because I judged that the introduction of all subjects purely speculative ought to be avoided, except when it was understood that it would lead to the study of those of a practical character, I have abstained from bringing forward any thing which had no connection with, or did not more or less lead to an acquaintance

---

* In confirmation of these statements we shall give the authority of Dr. Mosheim, who, when speaking of the *loci-communes* of many writers of that day, says, "that instead of following the simple and elegant style of Calvin in his Institutes, they made the science of divinity intricate by the introduction of the jargon of the schools into them. The philosophy of Aristotle," he adds, "which was taught in almost all the seminaries of learning, and suffered much from falling into bad hands, insinuated itself into the regions of theology, and rendered them barren, thorny, intricate, and gloomy, by the enormous multitude of barbarous terms, captious questions, minute distinctions, and useless subtleties, that followed in the train." He then adds, "This method of teaching theology must have been in use with all the reformed doctors before the synod of Dort, inasmuch as Episcopius' avoidance of it was the principal cause that had drawn on him the vehement hatred and opposition of all the other professors and teachers of theology."

---

* We can hardly form any notion of this "unintelligible jargon of words," which was made the medium of conveying pretended instruction; but we find in the writings of Mr. Hickman, a rigid Calvinist of 1659, the following sentiment, as quoted by Bishop Womack, in his *Calvinist's Cabinet Unlocked*, intended to prove that his doctrines did not make God the author of sin:—"Because it belongs to the universality of the first cause to produce not only every real being, but also the real positive modifications of beings; therefore we say, that in good works both the works themselves and their rectitude are positive, and are from God; in evil works there are also two things considerable, the works themselves, and their pravity; the works themselves, we doubt not, are positive, and from God, as all other positive things; but their pravities add no new entities to them, but consist in a mere privation." And farther, to get rid of the same charge of making God the author of sin, especially on the question of *the sinner hating God*, he says, "This is *complexum quid*, and must not be spoken of, as if it were one; the vital action or hatred is a thing positive, and consequently that is from God; but the undue referring or terminating of that act to such an object, which is altogether lovely; that is the sinfulness of the action. This is derived only from man's corruption and the devil's temptation; and where the cause itself is vicious, its vitiosity is not the cause of the vitiosity of the effect, for vitiosity of itself

---

neither can effect nor be effected." This sublimity is, we confess, beyond our reach.

* See *Classical Dictionary.*—Article IXION.

with, or tend to practical subjects. I have purposely and carefully avoided any reference to those superficial and vain disputes and questions, which by some are frequently debated with great earnestness and zeal, but which I have always considered as the nurseries of contention, the incentives and bellows of discord, the torments of genius, the lurking places of impiety, and the firebrands and fuel of schisms and dissensions: believing, as is really the case, that in the race of holiness we are called to run, in order to attain the prize of eternal life, nothing but what is serious, necessary, and conducive to the attainment of such an object ought to be proposed, and engage the attention of those who have entered upon it. Therefore have I never endeavoured to lead you into the secret recesses, the windings, the labyrinths, and intricacies of disputation; because I was fully persuaded that they could not profit the intelligent, though they might injure the ignorant. And while judging it to be the business of a prudent man studiously to avoid those things which do not essentially contribute to his salvation, I have especially believed it to be the business of the devout and pious man, not only to despise these frivolous matters of debate, but actually to reject them with scorn and disgust.

"In my researches after truth I have never deemed it right to confine myself to one commentator. For although I am fully conscious of my own weakness, yet have I never been able to bring myself to that state in which I could implicitly submit my belief and conscience to any one author, whatever might be the claims or pretensions with which he should appear before me. Indeed, I have considered that it did not accord with the character of a religious and devout person to be guided by the decisions of any man, but that his judgment should be inclined to that side which seemed to be most in unison with the dictates of truth and reason. Yea, I have always thought that those who invariably adhere to the interpretations of particular commentators or expositors, and remain as closely attached to them as leeches to a wound, without being willing to depart a straw's breadth from their opinions, are like slaves or oxen which are easily led hither and thither by the nose, or turned like the stone in a hand-mill, by the power and will of another. But, on the contrary, those who examine the opinions and claims of others and then judge for themselves, and who are not ashamed to learn even from an enemy, yea, and are willing to acquire real knowledge and solid truth from any one, without regard to his person, whether he be Greek or Trojan, they act the part of those who do not reject a costly stone, though found in the head of a toad;* nor despise an odoriferous perfume, though extracted from the excrescences of an animal.

"My chief care, therefore, has been to recall you from the vain, juggling, and sophisticated theology of the schools, back to the simplicity of the apostles, as to a starting post; and my attempts to accomplish this object were deemed by me of such importance, that I considered that he who had attained to this point of instruction was actually within reach of every other. For, believe me, whoever has once allowed his mind to be directed from this simplicity, and turned to the empty sophisms of the schools, will inevitably be drawn into interminable labyrinths, and entangled in nets and gins from which he cannot extricate himself; while every such attempt will only bind him firmer in these toils, just as the bird is more securely ensnared by its endeavours to escape the net of the fowler. For we must not suppose that any person, by the use of mere subtile distinctions, will be able to extricate himself from them. For it is of the nature of these distinctions, that when they have been adopted for the purposes of sophistry, in opposition to the signs of truth, they are like the spider's web, which usually entangles and retains the smaller species of flies and other insects, however easily broken by those of the larger kind. These distinctions, though of a very fruitful nature, are nevertheless like reeds, empty, rank, and frail, on which account it is found necessary that they should be supported by others, as props to their weakness; and as these again become weak and insufficient, a new train is originated to sustain them, till the whole, like bursted bladders or empty leathern bottles, fail and decay through their own emptiness and fragility. He, therefore, who would rightly and profitably philosophize and *θεολογειν*, that is, study and learn theology, must avoid these frivolous distinctions as he would shun the presence of so many harpies. And for this reason, that the language of truth is plain and simple.

---

* Shakspeare alludes to this fiction in his play of "As you Like it," Act 2.

"Another object which I have always proposed, was that of leading you to holiness of life, a course of conduct so rare as to be almost banished from the reformed world. To this state of things we ourselves have perhaps also culpably contributed, by not commending practical religion, as we ought to have done, in all its loveliness and excellence. I therefore determined to attempt, through you, the restoration of Christian holiness in our Churches; and I was the more especially urged to these measures from the conviction that, without this, the mere knowledge of theological truth would be of no avail, nor leave any hope of peace and unity to the Christian world, which are so important to the prosperity of religion. And because I saw that this general defect in religious character could not be remedied without exposing certain errors, which are incentives to, and apologies for, impiety, I, therefore, in connection with others, have been wholly intent upon removing the veil with which these pernicious dogmas are covered, and thus enabling you and other Christians to contemplate Divine truth and holiness in all their native loveliness and purity.

"I have always been of opinion that there are three capital errors which are blots and stains on our Reformation. The first is, that by which men are taught to believe that there are some particular persons destined, as if by name, by an irrevocable decree to eternal salvation; and in such a manner that their sins cannot provoke the wrath of God against them, but that all their offences, however heinous they may be, are accounted as venial, and which God will not charge against them, or render them subject to painful consequences on account of them. The second is, that which maintains that in order to our justification before God, it is only necessary to have a mere intellectual faith which believes that the guilt of all our sins is removed, not only of those committed before we believed, but likewise those we may commit after believing, even *ad infinitum*. The third is, that which positively affirms that true holiness consists in a mere affection of the mind, and in a cold, fruitless desire, or rather a bare and powerless attempt to do good, unaccompanied with any effect; and that those in whom this mere desire is found may nevertheless be justly deemed regenerated persons, although they live in the commission of the most aggravated vices and sins. I have always been fully persuaded that these three dogmas have been the great supports and the props of that impiety and profligacy which are so awfully prevalent among us. And it cannot possibly be otherwise than that the citadel of profanity must inevitably remain firm and unshaken so long as these bulwarks and buttresses, with which it is defended and its strength maintained, are allowed to continue unassailed by the force of a battering ram, or otherwise unattempted to be carried by storm. We have for this reason been induced, in various ways and at different times, to attack these errors, and with what degree of zeal and earnestness God knows, and you can but remember. And let this be no matter of surprise; for, in the Holy Scriptures, not only are reasons to be found for attacking them, but arms are everywhere furnished with which to assail and overthrow them. And this they do by contending for holiness as for a palladium;* which although it may not be discerned and acknowledged by those who are not decidedly devoted to religion, but, on the contrary, are prompted by the reception of error to deride its claims; nevertheless, by that person whose mind is deeply imbued with its hallowing influence, this will not only be seen as everywhere standing out on its pages, but as readily admitted, and devoutly acted upon. This arises out of the character of the affections of a religious mind, which instinctively tends to objects that are holy, and is as delicately sensitive of the touch of those which can injure its piety, as the foot can be of the thorn which wounds, and the eye of the particle of dust that pains it.

"The third subject of solicitude with me, was that of prompting you to promote peace and unity, which are the fruits of a gentle and amiable spirit; for I have always considered that amid the diversity of men's capacities, with the obscurity attending a great variety of theological subjects, and the perplexing questions arising out of the same, it is inevitably certain that a difference of sentiment and judgment will exist on several points, which may and ought to be left undecided, as to their exact import, by any fixed standard of interpretation; and which, under the law of charity, may be contemplated as occasions of that forbearance which is due to the limited state of human intellect and the frailties of our nature. I have therefore endeavoured, as far as I was able, to prevent you from falling into the three following evils:—The first is, that of cultivating a taste and passionate inclination for disputation and debate, especially upon matters which are of little or no value, through which it often happens that *truth* and *charity* are frequently lost; while all attempts to convey instructions in the way of disputation are usually found to be abortive. And this might be expected; for an obstinate mind will not easily yield even to the force of argument, and a docile one is rarely won amid the clamour of disputation and contention; and though the pious mind may be readily disposed to receive those instructions and directions which are given in the spirit of gentleness and meekness, yet, on the contrary, it will reject and despise those which are presented by a person of a captious and disputatious disposition, though they carry with them the evidences of truth itself. When, therefore, we wish to discomfit and chase away error, we must use friendly persuasion,—a persuasion as unaccompanied with the excitement of passion as the coldness of indifference. We ought indeed to be warm and fervid, but such a state should be the offspring of a special unction, which may be seen powerfully to act and move upon ourselves. In the second place, avoid rashness and precipitancy in condemning the errors of others, lest, indeed, like Minos and Rhadamanthus, you hastily and unjustly pass sentence upon all persons supposed to err, and with a magisterial tone arrogantly pronounce what you judge to be true and essential upon all doctrinal questions. For if ever there is a necessity that men should suspend their judgment, and practise εποχην moderation, most certainly it should be in so weighty and important an affair, which is admitted to involve the final salvation or perdition of many thousands, and not rashly pass judgment in a case allowed to be pregnant with such awful consequences. This is especially necessary on the part of youths and students, who have not yet attained that maturity of judgment and experience as to be enabled always to decide correctly between truth and error, and who from their juvenile state must be the subjects of limited knowledge and understanding; and, consequently, are incapable of duly examining and deciding upon any important and weighty point of doctrine with accuracy and precision. Finally, avoid creating dissensions and schisms, which like claws and teeth rend and tear the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, as though it were a contemptible, worthless garment. I have painfully witnessed that a wound, when inflicted, is not easily healed; and that when rents are created they commonly bring in their train hatred and continued strifes, so that the apostle has not, without just reason, placed schisms and contentions among the works of the flesh, which are to be condemned. I have always been persuaded, that so long as the great principles of *salvation* and *piety* are secure, all debates and controversies relating to mere matters of *opinion* ought not to prevent the intercourse of Christian friendship, or break the bonds of brotherly fellowship. Wherever we find mistake originating with ignorance or incapacity, so long as it is mere mistake, it ought to be commiserated in the spirit of kindness and piety, corrected by counsel and instruction, or tolerated with patience and forbearance; but with such persons who think otherwise, and deem it to be their duty to separate from others, however pious and devout, merely because they differ from them on some unimportant points of doctrine, I say that you ought to stand at the utmost distance from such persons, as the enemies of Christian liberty and peace.

---

* See *Classical Dictionary.*—Article PALLADIUM.

"This is a succinct statement of the scope and the end of all my professional labours and wishes. And although I have hitherto endeavoured, in the discharge of my duties, diligently and conscientiously to accomplish these objects, nevertheless I have not been able to avoid the hatred of those who judge nothing to be done aright which is not done by themselves, and who know nothing, and will know nothing beyond the opinions and *dictum* of their own doctors and commentators; and who, therefore, fearing to appear to be ἰδιογνωμονες, having an opinion of their own, are like automatons, who suffer themselves to be moved and directed by the agency of others. Such persons are generally accustomed to indulge themselves freely in cherishing suspicions against those who differ from them on any points of doctrine; and always view every new word adopted by others as a stone that conceals a viper, and every unusual species of phraseology as the means of conveying poison among those who hear them. Hence, it has been reported and believed among the people, that we have revived, and clothed under new appearances, all the ancient heresies; and that, in this manner, we have formed a strange religious medley, by resuscitating errors that had long been condemned and obsolete. These calumnies, with many other of the same kind, have been invented with the design of injuring our reputation. Against all these accusations and slanders I have no other means of vindication than that of my own innocence and the testimony of your consciences, believing that it is utterly impossible to silence the tongue of malevolence, reproach, and calumny; neither is it necessary, as Augustine says, to attempt it, when conscience itself utters no rebuke. The opinion which I wish you to entertain of me is, that I have endeavoured, so far as I was able, to restrain you, my disciples, and myself, within the bounds of modesty and moderation, whenever any difference of opinion should arise, relative to any of the secrets and mysteries of our holy religion. This I have done from a persuasion that it is not safe curiously to pry into, presumptuously to advance, and pertinaciously to defend other opinions and matters than those which our gracious Master has taught and revealed.* And verily, if we are not thus disposed, but on the contrary allow an unchecked license to our curiosity, and our propensity to pry and speculate, it will at length happen that we shall find no limits to their excitements, or boundary line to our inquiries, and should be like those who *are ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.* Of the correctness of this statement we could give abundant proof, if the evidences of fact at the present day did not render it unnecessary. For there are some persons who, when they have not known how to occupy their leisure time, have found relief in converting their studies into mere curious and vain speculations on theological subjects, and, as we are accustomed to say, rashly touching with unhallowed hands the most sacred and profound mysteries of our holy religion. And every man knows how such persons and their measures have tended to increase the swelling tide of disputation, which has already burst in upon the Christian world, spreading into a deep and boundless sea, which has broken down all embankments, and torn away every floodgate that modesty and prudence could erect, and completely overflowed and inundated this Christian republic. I was really often ashamed and disgusted when I was forced to pass these scholastic gulfs, and considered such an occupation as only producing an awful wreck of time, which tended to bear me forward to shoals and rocks, upon which even now I see some miserable men spend the whole of their lives. These scholastic queries are such miserable, weak, insipid, and contemptible things, that he who pores over them is likely to become a consumptive, feverish creature; or, if marked by lengthened years, he will evince the weakness and imbecility of age, only reaping, as the fruit of his labours, the madness of insanity, or the weakness of dotage.

---

* The importance of this caution can be hardly understood at the present day, and in order fully to see it, the reader should go back to the time of Episcopius, when the fierce debates then carried on by the Calvinistic divines, on the distinction between the secret and the revealed will of God, gave rise to the most awful and revolting statements.

"And in order that you might not be subject to the same *imbecile* condition, I deemed it proper to exhort you not to cherish a strong and irregular propensity to speculate; and have endeavoured, as far as I could, to keep you within the bounds of prudence, and dissuade you from every attempt to be wise above what is written. I have not repented of the efforts I adopted to attain this object; for I full well know how easily and how grievously men frequently err on those dogmas which are held to be the *ακροθινια*, chief points in theology, except limits be placed as to the mode and manner in which they and their dependent subjects are to be examined. The cautious manner of teaching on such topics which I have adopted in private, I have also rigidly regarded in public; for I am not one of those who, from the more extended liberty of teaching allowed in the private instructions of professors, would advance any thing in the college that I should blush to avow in the temple. And while there are many subjects of a mysterious nature, which may, if prudently, be occasionally investigated; yet even then I should recommend that such investigations be accompanied with caution, and that they be conducted in the most humble and reverential manner—the very character of them almost prohibiting the intrusions of human inquiry. And, indeed, I have always thought that, without bringing these matters at all into discussion, there would remain sufficient to us as means of instruction and rules of conduct, were these received as matters of pure belief, and as fixed axioms of theology, which are not to be debated, much less called into question. It is certainly far better to leave untouched certain points, especially if mysterious, for the sake of preserving unity and peace, than to adopt an opposite course at the risk of bringing discord and contention, since greater evil may arise from the interruption of unity, than profit and advantage can result from a supposed correct standard of judgment being attained on these difficult and undefinable subjects.

"If there are any who believe, judge, and write of me, as having any other object than that of promoting peace and unity by these instructions, they do my character and reputation great injury, and show that they are more influenced by passion and hatred than by a correct and well informed judgment. And because I do not wish farther to rebuke, or more severely to refer to such persons, I shall therefore turn to you, my beloved hearers. You have already heard me state the end and object that I proposed to myself from the beginning of my professional duties; if I have attained my wishes, at least in relation to any of you, so have I reason to rejoice; but if not, I have cause to grieve, although my conscience bears me undeviating witness, that if you have not attained the end which I proposed, this is not to be laid to my charge. Mine was the duty to put you in the way of arriving at the end proposed, and yours to endeavour to acquire it; and the testimony of my own heart that I aimed at this, has been to me a shield and a brazen wall, with which I defend myself against the malignant and unjust suspicions with which I am assailed. For I know before whom I must shortly appear, and what will be required of me by the great βραβευτης and αγωνοθετης the judge and awarder of eternal glory, Jesus, the Lord of life and death, and that he will not only demand from me this body, this life, this soul, this spirit, which I have, but also will require the souls and blood of you all at my hands, and also of all those who through you might, by my guiltiness, be led into the devious and dangerous paths of destruction.

"It is to me, indeed, a matter of very little importance to be judged by the men of this day, but, on the contrary, I esteem it an honour to be the object of the hatred of some of the high, and the envy of the low. And I deem it an occasion of satisfaction to be assailed and covered with slander and falsehood, provided that I retain a conscience undefiled, and present it unstained with your blood before Him who alone is the judge of men, and who shall reveal the hidden things of the heart, *when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe.* Nevertheless, I am not so vain as to suppose that I am incapable of committing an error, or that I am exempt from the failings and imperfections incident to human nature; yet I hope and trust that the gracious Lord will forgive me in that which has been wrong. And now let me entreat you who have devoted yourselves to God, if there has been any affection in your hearts toward me, that you aim with me at this one thing, namely, to preserve your conscience pure until the coming of the Son of man; for this being neglected, some have made shipwreck of faith,—a loss to which nothing is equal, or indeed can be compared. Hold, therefore, in reverence the truth which you have received, and form not a judgment of any matter, or of me, to secure the favour of any persons contrary to the dictates of reason and conscience.

"It is the business of worldly politicians to accommodate their sentiments to the current of public opinion, just as the vessel shifts her sails to catch a favourable gale. Divines, on the contrary, ought to preserve constancy under all circumstances, and to stand at the utmost distance from every thing like that wavering and indecision which mark the character of others amid the eventful times and changes in which we live. Emulate, therefore, the conduct of the holy and devout. *Let your* *light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is heaven.* Follow after meekness and long-suffering; and *as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Let your moderation be known unto all men.* Finally, show yourselves to be governed by the Spirit of the Lord, who hath the power of life and death over you and me.

"If I have succeeded in contributing to form in you that state of mind I have just been describing, nothing can happen to me, however painful, which I shall not willingly endure. Then it will be my glory to reflect that, instead of contributing to make you contentious, irreligious, or schismatical, you have become meek, gentle, peaceable, devout, and holy Christians; and thus I shall look forward to that great day when I shall present you as a grateful and acceptable odour to my Lord and Redeemer. Sustained with this hope and this assurance, I could even brave the terrors of death in their most appalling forms. In the meantime, while I am absent from you, being called away to defend the cause and truth of Jesus Christ, do this one thing for my sake, and as a parting token of your esteem,—promise me that you will, day and night, besiege the throne of Divine grace, that God would be propitious to me and the cause I am about to defend. If he hear you, vow with me to present him with devout acknowledgments; but if not, pledge yourselves to be patient under suffering and reproach.

"And thou, O Lord Jesus, who beholdest the very secrets of our hearts, undertake our cause, and be gracious to our university, our Church, and our country.—AMEN."

CHAPTER X.

THE history of the Synod of Dort derives particular interest from the fact of its assuming the character of a council of the Non-Lutheran Churches of Europe, assembled for the purpose of fixing the bounds of religious opinion to the greater part of the Reformed Churches. In the early periods of their formation, Dr. Mosheim says, "No standard was erected by them as the rule of correct thinking in these matters, and even while Calvin was expounding his system in Geneva there was not any public law or confession of faith that obliged the Reformed Churches in any part of the world to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that were taught in that seminary." This circumstance left the parties listening to them, at liberty to reject or adopt them. And, accordingly, by some they were disavowed, while, by others, they were not only received, but carried out beyond the views of this reformer. Those who embraced his sentiments were divided into two classes, denominated supralapsarians and sublapsarians. The latter considered Adam's fall merely as being permitted, and that his descendants, thereby being made sinful, might justly be reprobated. The former asserted that God, in order to exercise his awful justice and free mercy, had decreed from all eternity the transgression of Adam, and so ordered the course of events that he must necessarily sin. Prior to the time of Arminius' divulging his sentiments, which, to a great extent, were similar to those held by Ambrose in the fourth century,* the principal debates among the reformed theologians were between the supralapsarians and sublapsarians; but so soon as certain divines felt it to be their duty to represent the Deity as extending his goodness and mercy to all mankind, these two classes of theologians gave up their debates, and, forgetting their differences as matters of little importance, united their forces to crush what was deemed an awful and dangerous error, which maintained that God is loving to every man, and hateth nothing that his hands have made. And to carry out their abhorrence of this statement, the Synod of Dort was assembled to excommunicate and banish those who advocated it. This union of the supra and sublapsarians, though it arrayed a mighty host against the benevolence of Christianity as it was exhibited by the fathers of the Christian Church during the first three centuries, was, however, ultimately an advantage to Christendom: for, prior to a check being given to the darings of some of the supralapsarians by those writers who presented the image of Divine goodness to the reformed world as it is exhibited by our philanthropic and holy religion, the former had proceeded to such lengths in their description of God, in creating men for and adapting means to secure their misery and damnation, so as to present him, who, in the language of Scripture, is said to be LOVE, as a being, of whom, in point of malignity, the prince of the lower regions is but a faint image and expression. Let not the modern Calvinist, who cannot or will not read the immense mass of quotations from the writings of the leading men of that school, as they were collected by the Remonstrants, in proof of the horrible sentiments maintained by their opponents, attempt to deny this statement. These men, to show that they had dealt fairly with the writers whose sentiments they quoted, appended to each passage the name of its respective author, and the faithfulness of these quotations has never yet been questioned. "Not only would the minds of all sober Christians in these days be shocked when perusing the monstrous sentiments propounded in these extracts, but even the Calvinists of Cromwell's time, rigid as they were, felt themselves scandalized by any allusion to them, and would not admit that their opinions had the least affinity to such desecrating dogmas."*

---

* Dr. Miller, in his Philosophy of Modern History, says, "Arminius proposed, in the year 1604, a modification of the doctrine of predestination, which had already, in the fourth century, been held by Ambrose, that the decrees of God, by which he determined the future condition of every individual, were not absolute and irrespective, but were formed in reference to that foreknowledge by which the conduct of each individual was foreseen, so that each should be eternally happy or miserable, not according to an arbitrary determination of the Almighty, but according to his own conduct in the present life, foreseen, yet not controlled."*

In support of this opinion, this writer gives the following passage in the form of a note:—"As it is unreasonable to refer the foreknowledge of God to his present consciousness of his own purposes, such an application involving a direct contradiction, it must relate to the future conduct of men, foreseen as the ground of the Divine determinations; and therefore these determinations cannot be, as the Calvinists represent them, *irrespective* or void of reference to the actions of men."

* In commenting on the following passage, *Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate*, Ambrose remarks, "He did not predestinate before he foreknew, but he predestinated the rewards of those whose obedience he foreknew."—See *Tomline on Calvinism.*

---

* See *Watson's Dictionary*, article CALVINISM.

That the excitement consequent upon religious controversy and debate may carry men to make certain statements which they would not adopt in their more sober moments, will be readily admitted. And it is hoped that this was the case with many of those writers whose declarations are so awfully revolting and injurious to the character of the Divine Being, and his attributes of goodness, wisdom, and mercy, as exhibited in the Scriptures; and who, while presenting a system of fate which never had a precedent save in the teachings of the Koran, accompanied it with other opinions connected with this subject far more odious than any thing ever dictated by the prophet of Mecca. So much were the members of this synod aware of this fact that they seemed alarmed at any allusion to them, and when Episcopius, who, according to Mosheim, "was admired even by his enemies, on account of the depth of his judgment, the extent of his learning, and the force of his eloquence," did, in connection with his brethren, wish to begin the defence of their cause by refuting the opinions of the Calvinists, they peremptorily forbade his making any such attempt. The design of the Arminians, says this writer in this proposal, was probably to get the people on their side, by such an unfavourable representation of the Calvinistic system, as it had been exhibited by many of these very synodists; and in this way to excite disgust in the minds of those that were present against its patrons and abettors.*

---

* Mr. Nichols says, in his *Arminianism and Calvinism Compared*, that about four years before the Synod of Dort, the predestinarian controversy was conducted on both sides with much spirit and ability. Some of the Calvinistic professors, who had been accustomed to utter the wildest and most revolting opinions that ever escaped from human lips, were compelled to observe greater reserve and caution, lest their adversaries should expose the irreverence and blasphemy of all such expressions. The whole Calvinistic brotherhood throughout France, Germany, and the Low Countries, had received warning letters to be guarded in the delivery of their opinions. But Macchovius, professor at Franeker, who disregarded this caution, continued to speak in the same fearless and unguarded manner as he had always done; and the Arminians, as might have been expected, quoted several of his expressions in proof of the demoralizing tendency of such an exhibition of Calvin's doctrines. This incensed the Presbyterian class at Franeker, who prepared a charge against him, which finally came before the Synod of Dort

"And it is more than probable that one of the principal reasons which engaged the members of this synod to reject this proposal, was a consideration of the genius and eloquence of Episcopius, and an apprehension of the effects they might produce upon the multitude,"* when employed in attacking their opinions.

Allowing Dr. Mosheim to be correct, and we see no reason to question the accuracy of his opinion, then the measures of the synod, in not allowing the Arminians to attack Calvinism, and especially some of the sentiments of those who were its advocates, were not only paying homage to the splendid talents of Episcopius, the leader of the Remonstrants at this synod, as just intimated, but were indicative of their consciousness of the rash and awfully irreverent statements which had been made by many of those who were then sitting to be the judges of the Arminians.

This venerable synod, it is true, met to adjust the varied and jarring sentiments of Calvinistic divines, and if possible, to draw out a scheme that should not outrage the feelings of those who were of the milder cast. In accomplishing this object it had much difficulty, while such a man as Gomarus, the great opponent of Arminius, and a number of his friends who had espoused his views, were for carrying their supralapsarian sentiments to the height of their wishes. And it was only in consequence of the more moderate counsels of the British divines, that a milder system of predestination passed the synod, to the sore displeasure of the more rigid fatalists. This circumstance gave to the Calvinism of this assembly an aspect which was the very image of mildness and beneficence when compared with that which was advocated prior to this period by the generality of the Dutch divines.†

---

for adjudication, but he was saved from condemnation by the craft of Festus Hommius.—*Part I*, p. 199.

* Mosheim, vol. v, p. 452.

† Though the system of Calvinism, thus modelled by the Synod of Dort, assumed a milder form than it did as presented by the writers quoted in the *Acta Remonstrantium*, nevertheless the reader should not forget the statement of Dr. Mosheim, as quoted at page 32, "that the peculiar doctrines to which the victory was assigned by the Synod of Dort, were absolutely unknown in the first three centuries of the Christian Church." This fact Calvin and the

As to the doctrine of Arminius, which maintained, with that of the Lutherans, the universal benevolence of God, and asserted, according to the primitive Church, that God had excluded none from salvation, this synod met for the purpose of denouncing this sentiment, and, at the same time, ruining the Remonstrants, who defended it. Their condemnation was determined before the national synod met, and it was "assembled, not so much to examine the doctrines of the Arminians, in order to see whether they were worthy of toleration and indulgence, as to publish

older divines of this school in a certain way admitted; and "they tell us plainly, that they found all the Christian fathers, both of the Greek and the Latin Church, down to the age of St. Augustine, quite unmanageable for their purpose; and therefore occasionally bestow upon them and their productions epithets not the most courteous. Yet some modern writers, not possessing half the splendid qualifications of those veterans in learning, make a gorgeous display of the little that they know concerning antiquity; and wish to lead their readers to suppose that the whole stream of early Christianity has flowed down only in their channel. Every one must have remarked how much like Calvin all those fathers speak whose works are quoted by Toplady in his 'Historic Defence.' Nor can the two Milners, in their 'History of the Church,' entirely escape censure on this account—though both were excellent men, and better scholars than Toplady. But from the manner in which they 'show up' only those ancient Christian authors, some of whose sentiments *seem* to be nearly in unison with their own, they induce the unlearned or half-informed to draw the erroneous conclusion—that the peculiarities of Calvinism are not the inventions of a comparatively recent era, and that they have always formed a prominent part of the profession of faith of every Christian community since the days of the apostles."—*Watson's Bib. and Theo. Dict.*, article CALVINISM.

This unjustifiable mode of proceeding, as thus adopted by Milner in his Church History, has recently been noticed by Professor Rose in a divinity lecture, in which he says, "Mr. Milner was bigotedly attached to certain opinions, [that is, of the Calvinist school,] and quite resolved to find, or make them everywhere, and to give the history—not of Christianity, but—of certain opinions, which he deemed to be the whole of it." And for making this statement, the correctness of which no unprejudiced person can question, the late Mr. Scott, of Hull, threatened to visit him with summary chastisement. But this boasting threatening ended in his producing a mere array of names to show that Mr. Joseph Milner was not wanting in scholarship, while he has left untouched Mr. Rose's principal charge against Milner, that he wrote "under party views, and that his book was obviously a party book," and not a representation of the truths of Christianity.—See *Christian Observer*, Oct., 1831.

and execute with a certain solemnity, with an air of justice, and with the suffrage and consent of foreign divines, whose authority was respectable, a sentence already drawn up, and agreed upon by those who had the principal direction of affairs."*

In this respect the Synod of Dort bore a striking resemblance in its proceedings to the Council of Trent,† which had met in the preceding century to regulate the tenets and observances of the Roman Catholics; and while there was this professed difference between the two assemblies, that the Council of Trent acknowledged the authority of tradition, in conjunction with the canonical Scriptures, the synod, on the contrary, admitted no other standard of religious opinion than the sacred writings. But though, in conformity with the spirit of the religion of Protestants, the Bible was acknowledged to possess exclusive authority, the actual proceedings of this synod were sufficiently similar to those of the council. "The cause of the Arminians‡ was in effect decided before it was examined, as that of the Protestants was prejudged in the Council of Trent." Of this fact the Arminians were fully aware. It is true, they might not be apprehensive that they should be subject to such cruel and iniquitous treatment as banishment from their country, their homes, their flocks, and their friends; neither had they any reason to suppose it, inasmuch as the States of Holland had, by their deputies, again and again, at least verbally, promised that no bodily harm should result to them, from the circumstance of the synod being assembled to examine the points in dispute, and their being cited there on account of them. But in this they violated their faith, as the Catholic princes did with John Huss. For, though they made the above promise, yet they would not allow them to quit Dort, or visit their homes, even when the most pressing family afflictions, or the death of their relations occurred; and they finally bore them out of the country as felons, without permission to see their friends, settle their affairs, or provide for the future support of their families.

This severity manifested toward the Remonstrants, might probably arise from their courageous bearing, especially as in the case of Episcopius, who was the inspiring soul of all their proceedings. The synod had supposed that they should awe them, but they were not easily to be depressed or borne down. They had espoused their doctrines from conviction, and were prepared to defend and suffer for them; and accordingly before the synod had assembled, they met in large numbers at Leyden, to deliberate upon the most suitable means to be adopted for the defence of their cause, and to select those persons who should be deputed on the part of the whole body to appear in the synod. At the same time, they unanimously passed the following resolution:—"That their cause, which was good and holy, was on no account to be abandoned; but, on the contrary, in the same degree that their adversaries attempted to destroy it, they were bound to defend it; and that it behoved them conscientiously and fearlessly to appear in its defence, as before God, their Churches, and the religious world; and to acquit themselves in its behalf to the utmost of their capabilities, and then leave the issue with God."

---

* Mosheim, vol. v, p. 454. † Kerroux, tome ii, p. 500. ‡ Idem.

That the Remonstrants acted up to the spirit and letter of this resolution, the history of the proceedings of this famous synod, given in the following pages, will decidedly prove. Their conduct in this respect was matter of deep mortification and chagrin to the Dutch divines, and Maurice's packed* assembly of the States, whose delegates evinced the utmost want of propriety in their treatment of the cited clergymen, to whose condemnation, as before hinted, they added cruelty, insult, mockery, and reproach. At the above-named assembly, the Remonstrants selected the three following ministers, John Arnoldi Corvinus, Philip Pynacker, and Assuerus Matthisius, who should, in the name of all the Remonstrants, present the following request either before the synod or the lay commissioners appointed by their high mightinesses, the States, namely: "That a competent number of them should be allowed, under safe protection, to appear in the synod to state and vindicate their Christian cause; and that for this purpose they might be permitted to choose from among themselves those persons whom they deemed the most eligible for this object, whom they would send in due time to the synod." Episcopius who had been summoned by the States to ap-

---

* Dr. Maclaine, the translator of Mosheim, who, as a Calvinist, takes every opportunity of venting his spleen against the Arminians, chooses to rebut the statement of Mosheim, when he asserts that "the Synod of Dort was convoked by the authority of Maurice," and says that it was appointed by the order of the States-General. True, he adds, the States were not, indeed, unanimous, three of the seven provinces protesting against the holding of this synod, namely, Holland, Utrecht, and Overyssel. But while he admits this, he has not the frankness to state that Holland was not only the chief of the seven provinces, and paid more of the public taxes than the whole of the remaining six, and therefore was entitled to the greatest consideration, and consequently that it was a manifest act of injustice to convoke this synod in opposition to its remonstrances, the more especially as "each of the provinces, by the treaty of Utrecht, was left at liberty to regulate the affairs of religion in the manner most conducive to its interest." This he must have known, and yet he represents Barneveldt's urging this as though it were a mere opinion of this celebrated and upright statesman.*

* So completely warped is this writer by his attachment to Calvinism,

---

Not less disingenuously does he hide the fact, that it was by eight of his creatures assuming the name of the States that Maurice ventured to change the magistracy of different cities, and imprison Barneveldt, Hoogerbeets, and Grotius, and thus prepare the way for the formation of a States-General, who should answer to his bidding, and by which this famous synod was convoked and all its proceedings ratified.

This gentleman, in a note at page 450, vol. v, throws out some dark inuendoes of certain guiltiness on the part of the leading men of the Arminians, and intimates that if it were not a warrant for the severity of the treatment of their persecutors toward them, yet it may be adduced as an apology for them. He grounds these inuendoes, he says, on some anecdotes contained in certain *letters*, *memoirs*, and *negotiations*, of Sir Dudley Carlton, which the earl of Hardwick published. "These," however, he is forced to admit, "are not free from party spirit." The haughty diplomatist here alluded to, who was the great enemy of Barneveldt; and materially contributed to the convocation of this synod, had, however, the frankness to say, "that a long time before judgment was pronounced on the doctrines of the Arminians, the punishment of exile, with some other marks of infamy had been determined against the principal divines of the Arminian party."—See *Grattan, Nichols, Modern Univ. Hist.*, vol. xxxi, p. 222.

that his jealousy takes fire the moment he supposes that Mosheim is not sufficiently laudatory on certain advocates of this creed, who were esteemed by him as household gods, and intimates that he has taken the liberty of being a little more profuse in his praises of them in his translation than his author; and then, in a way perfectly in character with this conduct, when Mosheim speaks of the distinguished writers of his own communion, as for instance Melancthon, he instantly cautions the reader "not to forget that the author of this history is a Lutheran."

pear at Dort, to take his seat as professor in the synod, accompanied these gentlemen, who arrived in Dort on the sixteenth of November, when he immediately waited upon the deputies from Holland, to inform them that he had appeared pursuant to the summons of the States, for the purpose of taking his place in the synod, and to make, also, an apology for his late arrival, informing them, at the same time, of the coming of the persons who had accompanied him, with the object of their visit to Dort. The deputies sent for these ministers, and having learned their wishes, acquainted them with the resolution adopted by the synod on the preceding day, namely: "that it had resolved to select and cite some of the Remonstrants from among the whole body to appear before the synod, and that the persons so to be cited had already been fixed upon, and that the letters of citation from the synod and lay deputies were either preparing, or were already prepared." Having made this statement, they then showed them the names of those persons who were to be cited.

When these ministers received information of these proceedings, which originated under the directions of Bogerman and those of his friends, the rigid Calvinistic party, who had placed him in that situation, they saw that they had just grounds for bitter complaint, and said to these lay gentlemen, that it was most unreasonable that persons who were perfectly willing to appear in the synod, must nevertheless be brought there in the character of cited persons; and that it was manifestly unjust to place Episcopius among this number, who had been invited by the States of Holland to take his place among the other professors in the synod, and had actually come for that very purpose. Therefore, if the synod was determined thus to act, it would give occasion not only to them, but to all good men, to view their proceedings with distrust and dissatisfaction.

The deputies, in reply, informed them that all attempts to gain a revision of the resolution of the synod, would be perfectly useless. On hearing this statement, the ministers said, "that if the synod would not allow the Remonstrants to vindicate their cause in any other character than that of cited persons, they prayed that, at least, the citations might be sent to the Remonstrants as a body, and not to particular persons; that they might thereby be allowed to select such persons to send to the synod as they might consider the most capable of vindicating their doctrine in particular, and their whole cause in general. The justice of this," they said, "must appear, inasmuch as they were better capable of judging who were the best qualified to defend them, rather than their enemies." The deputies peremptorily replied that their request would not be complied with; but these ministers being urgent upon this point, the others counselled them to present their request in the form of a petition to a full assembly of the lay commissioners from the various provinces. The Remonstrants accordingly prepared and presented their petition the following day, which was to this effect:—

"*Worshipful and Honourable Gentlemen,—*

"Forasmuch as your honours have thought that it might be of use to this nation and the Church, that some of the Remonstrants should be cited before the national synod assembled in this town of Dort, that there might be set on foot in the fear of the Lord, a conference for the examination of the truth according to the word of God, wherein the reasons on both sides might be examined and tried by the Holy Scripture, the only rule and judge of controversy: and having heard that your honours have already prepared letters for that purpose to such Remonstrants whom you had before thought fit to call to the synod; we, therefore, the underwritten ministers, who arrived here yesterday, on the part, and by the order of our brethren the Remonstrants, (with the renowned Dr. Simon Episcopius, professor of divinity in the university of Leyden, invited to the synod some time since, by letters from their lordships, the States of Holland and West Friesland, together with other professors of divinity,) in order jointly and submissively to desire that the Remonstrants may be allowed to appear in a competent number at the synod, for the defence of their cause, and for declaring the reasons of their opinions about the controverted points, (which is what the Remonstrants have always greatly desired, and still do desire,) do most humbly and dutifully beseech, entreat, and supplicate your honours, that the said Remonstrants themselves may be allowed the liberty of choosing, appointing, and deputing to the synod from their assembly such as they shall judge the best qualified for advocates and defenders of their cause, without excepting even those who, about a week before the opening of the synod, and some of them after it was actually opened, were deprived of their ministry; that so it may not appear that the Contra-Remonstrants have designedly disarmed us of the defence of those from whom we expect the most assistance, and which, it seems as if they themselves thought, would not a little retard their affairs; and we pray particularly that all those Remonstrants who were at the conference of the Hague may appear at the same time with the rest of their brethren before the synod; it being but just that those who have hitherto jointly promoted the interests of our body to the best of their power, should from henceforward defend and justify the same cause with their united labours, when it shall be brought before the very learned assembly of foreign divines; and to that end should each of them, without exception, be allowed a safe conduct for going to and returning from the synod: which equitable and well grounded request of ours, in case your honours will vouchsafe to grant us, we solemnly promise that within a fortnight, to be counted from next Tuesday, we will appear before the synod at Dort, by the grace of God, in such numbers as your honours shall direct; and we entirely hope that the whole Church and nation will reap much benefit from this conference, and inquiry into the truth of things. Which God Almighty grant, through his dear Son. AMEN."

This was signed by the above three ministers; and a little lower was written, "I likewise earnestly pray the same, by order, and on behalf of the brethren.

"SIMON EPISCOPIUS, Professor of Divinity."

To this the commissioners returned a verbal answer, from which we extract the following particulars:—

"That they adhered to the last resolution of the synod, not thinking fit to allow that the Remonstrants should pass for a distinct body, or make any deputation of persons in their common name, to treat of their affairs at the synod; nor could they suffer every one of the Remonstrant ministers to appear at the synod, who were present at the Hague, particularly Uitenbogaerdt and Grevinchovius. As to the safe conduct which they desired," the commissioners added, "they might rest satisfied it should not be denied them. None should be detained or molested by the synod for an ecclesiastical matter. And that the cited should have liberty to make any statement without molestation or danger; or otherwise to act as the nature of their affairs might seem to require."

Our countryman, Hales, seems to have been strongly impressed with the injustice of these proceedings against the Remonstrants, and says that the business was arranged principally between the lay commissioners, the president, Bogerman, and Festus, with his fellow secretaries. The lay gentlemen belonging to the Remonstrants in various parts of Holland loudly complained of this conduct, and said that they were of opinion that their ministers had the same right as the Contra-Remonstrants to depute persons to this synod, and sit there as members of it, being lawfully called to the ministry, and their doctrines recognized by the government in a resolution of the States in support of mutual toleration. And they farther said that it was the height of injustice to cite them as criminals and private persons before a synod which consisted chiefly of their adversaries. They justified their claim to this privilege for their ministers, by appealing to the conduct of Maurice, elector of Saxony, who, at a diet of the empire, had protested against the Council of Trent, declaring that he would not own its legality, unless the Protestant divines were allowed to debate and vote as other members of the council; and this liberty, they contended, ought to have been conceded to the Remonstrants. The Contra-Remonstrants, however, in reply, said that they could not allow the validity of this appeal, "as they did not recognize the Remonstrant ministers as orthodox pastors in the Reformed Church, their opinions being different from that of the reformed religion." The deputies of the Remonstrants seeing it was utterly impossible to accomplish their wish to obtain a repeal of the resolution of the synod, promised to appear before it as cited persons at the appointed time, Episcopius also agreeing to be joined with them as such, although he was invited by a letter from their lordships, the States of Holland, to take his seat as a member of the synod, in virtue of his office as professor. On the eighteenth of November they departed from Dort, and just as they were preparing to enter the boat, the letters of citation were presented to them, one of which was from the lay deputies, and directed to them collectively; the others from the synod were addressed to each in particular. And at the same time there were given to them similar letters to be delivered to the other cited Remonstrant ministers, whom they might see as they passed through the places where they resided.

The letter from the lay commissioners asserts that the Remonstrants "may freely propose, declare, and defend their doctrines relating to the five points, as far as they can, or as they judge it necessary." The one addressed by the synod to the Remonstrants, after giving the names of the cited persons, declares that they were to appear in the synod, "to the end that they may freely propose, explain, and defend, as far as they can, or shall think necessary, the aforesaid articles or points, before the synod." How far they abided by these declarations will be seen from the statements presented in the subsequent parts of this work.

The fourteen days allowed to the cited Remonstrants to prepare to appear at Dort, drawing to a close, they with several other ministers assembled at Rotterdam, on which occasion it was resolved that the conditions proposed for the holding of a synod, by the six Remonstrant ministers at the conference of the Hague, of which we have previously spoken, should at a suitable time be presented to the synod, supported by extracts from the writings of the most eminent of the Reformed doctors and accompanied with the most powerful arguments in favour of such a plan. This petition they designed to be presented to the synod, earnestly requesting that the conditions it contained might be adopted as a suitable rule for amicably treating of the various subjects about to be brought under their consideration. They also drew up an account of the state of the controversy between the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants, arising out of the five disputed points, for the purpose of exonerating themselves from the imputation of attempting to delay the proceedings of the synod.

Having thus made the necessary arrangements, the cited ministers hastened to Dort, where they arrived late in the evening on the fifth of December. On the same day, in a full assembly of the synod, the president had stated that the fourteen days allowed to the cited Remonstrants had elapsed, and therefore he called upon them individually, by their Christian and surnames, summoning them to appear. The following day the Remonstrants sent four of their party, first to the president of the lay deputies, and afterward to Bogerman, the president of the ecclesiastics, to inform them of their arrival; requesting that as the trunks containing their papers had not yet arrived, a day or two might be allowed them to arrange their affairs before they entered the synod. The president replied that he himself could not grant their request, and that they must present it to the synod in person. They accordingly appeared before the synod for that purpose, when the president immediately informed them that the time appointed for their appearance in that assembly had expired the day before, and that he had laid their request before the synod, which had resolved that they should present it personally. Episcopius then, in the name of all the cited, wished grace, peace, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, to the synod: after which he said that, in pursuance of the orders of their superiors, he and his brethren had appeared within the appointed time, inasmuch as fourteen days had not yet elapsed since the receipt by some of them of the last letters. He then stated the wish of himself and his brother ministers that a little time should be allowed them to arrange their papers, in order that they might be prepared to justify what they deemed their good cause, and which they had hitherto, under the dictate of conscience before God, solemnly maintained. Nevertheless, in this matter they did not wish to dictate to the synod, but should leave it with the lay deputies to determine the reasonableness of this request. And if it could not be granted, they would at once prepare to proceed to the conference about the five points.

They were then ordered to retire, and, after a short time, were again summoned before the synod, when the president informed them, "that the synod had come to the conclusion to allow them till the morrow to prepare to appear before it, adding, at the same time, that this venerable assembly had judged it proper to admonish them as to the word *collatio, conference*, which might be understood to imply a colloquy between equal parties, such as had been held formerly in Holland; but the cited were to understand that they were summoned there merely to propose, explain, and defend their opinions, and then to submit them to the decision of the synod." In fact, they were told that the synod was met to *judge*, and not to *confer*. Episcopius answered, "that as to the word *conference*, it was not necessary to criticise it with such nicety. They had come with no other intention than that of treating upon the points of doctrine on account of which they had been cited to appear before the synod; the mode in which this should be done might be determined at the time of entering on the discussion of them." Having made this statement, he then earnestly repeated the request formerly made to the lay commissioners, that they would permit them to send for Grevinchovius and Goulart to assist them in defending their cause; and he added that, by this request, he and his brother ministers did not seek to delay the proceedings of the synod, since they were ready to enter upon the business for which they were cited before their arrival. They were informed that an answer to this request would be given at nine o'clock the next morning.

On the same day the Remonstrants waited upon the foreign divines, greeting as many as they could meet with at their lodgings, commending their good cause to them; beseeching them also impartially to hear the vindication of themselves and their cause, and use their influence to mitigate the bitterness and asperity of the Contra-Remonstrants; and endeavour to promote moderation among the members of the synod. They also entreated them to interpose their good offices with the lay deputies in order to put a stop to the unjust proceedings of certain synods, particularly in South Holland, which were sending persons through the provinces, from Church to Church, who, under various pretexts, were deposing their brethren from the ministry; and strive to prevent such cruel measures being pursued, especially as the national synod was engaged in matters that so deeply affected them. They urged them likewise to assist them in obtaining the help of Grevinchovius and Goulart.

They were generally received with much kindness and courtesy by the foreign divines. Many of these gentlemen manifested much displeasure on hearing that the Remonstrants had almost everywhere been deposed from their ministry, and thrust out of their Churches, while as yet their cause was pending,—nay, even before it was brought before the synod. Some of these clergymen, however, they found very much prejudiced against them: among these was Diodatus, of Geneva, who upbraided them with having reviled the name of Calvin, taunting them also by saying that, had they the power, they would take those measures against the opposite party which were likely to be pursued against themselves. But others of the foreign divines, in the way of kind intimation, gave them to understand that they must be prepared for painful results. The Remonstrants thought it proper to make these gentlemen acquainted with the true state of their affairs, and for this purpose they put into their hands two documents, the one printed and the other written, in which were given an account of them with their proceedings, as also the treatment they had met with up to that moment.

The synodists, having heard that the Remonstrants had waited upon the foreign divines, were greatly mortified, and intimated that they had attempted to prejudice these gentlemen in favour of their cause before it was heard; and informed them that, if they had any thing to communicate to these divines, it must be done publicly in the synod. The Remonstrants justified their conduct on the principle of self defence, seeing that persons, as before stated, had gone through the land, whose track resembled that of the angel of destruction, in being marked by anguish, mourning, and desolation; and to attempt to win over the foreign divines to the side of mercy and pity, on behalf of their afflicted brother ministers and desolate families, was, they said, an act they owed to them on the common principles of brotherhood and charity.

On the following day, being the 7th of December, the Remonstrants were summoned into the presence of the synod, when the resolution of the lay commissioners was read to them, containing a refusal of their request for Grevinchovius and Goulart to be allowed to appear in the synod to assist them; nevertheless, as a special favour, it was said they might come to Dort and privately aid them. After hearing this resolution, Episcopius stood up and asked permission to speak a few words, and no objection being offered to this request, he proceeded to address the venerable assembly in the following oration.

In presenting this we are aware that we may tax the patience of the reader; nevertheless, in justice to the subject of these memoirs and the Remonstrants, we deem it right to insert it in these pages, from the fact of its being to a great extent historical in its statements, giving an account of their conduct, the motives by which they were governed, the objects they proposed, and the treatment they met with prior to their being summoned before the Synod of Dort. Our deep regret is, that it will necessarily appear in so feeble a form when compared with the nervous and energetic character in which it is found in the original. The Latinity of Episcopius is singularly chaste and copious, and, according to Father Mabillon, "his style is fine, and the manner of treating his subjects is answerable to the style."*

AN ORATION

DELIVERED BY SIMON EPISCOPIUS IN THE NATIONAL SYNOD OF DORT.

"Illustrious and most potent Lords, reverend, famous, and learned Men and Brethren,—

"Before entering upon the remarks we wish to present to you, we deem it right, as being in accordance with the dictate of Christianity and the example of the apostles, most devoutly to pray to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ for all of you in general and each of you in particular, that he would grant unto you his grace and peace, with the assistance of his Holy Spirit, to inspire and suggest unto you those wholesome counsels and salutary directions, by which you may be enabled to allay the troubles which, alas, so awfully agitate our country, and distract our afflicted Churches and people. Amen.

---

* *Bayle's Dictionary*, article EPISCOPIUS.

"Having uttered these our wishes and prayers as expressive of the feelings of our hearts, we would beg leave of this assembly to say a few words, in order that we and our affairs may not be *ανευ προοιμιου*, without an introduction, on appearing before it; and, therefore, we most earnestly entreat you, for a short period, to listen to the few words we may have to say on this most memorable occasion.

"Of all the varied and numerous subjects of inquiry which have interested the attention of man, from the most remote ages to the present period, there is not one which ought to be deemed by the Christian as equally momentous with that which can contribute to his obtaining correct views of true religion, and enable him to avail himself of those means necessary to the diffusion of its saving and hallowing influence. For all other subjects of solicitude, when compared with this, are infinitely inferior to and below the dignity of man, and ought to be considered, especially by a devout and holy person, as only designed to meet those wants he has in common with the brute, to which, as it has been significantly said, instincts are given as necessary to keep their bodies from corruption.

"The objects, therefore, which ought chiefly to occupy the inquiries of man, are indicated, not so much by the fact of his being endowed with reason, for of this the brute has in common with himself certain features and lineaments, as by the possession of those higher endowments which render him capable of receiving religious instruction, and being made the subject of religious enjoyment. These, when directed and governed by Divine truth, point him to the pathway that leads to ineffable blessedness, and prepare him for the participation of its immortal enjoyments. And while it belongs to private individuals to be deeply anxious for their own immediate religious welfare, yet it is the imperative duty of princes, rulers, magistrates, patrons of Churches, and ministers, to whom belong especially the affairs of spiritual government, and the preservation of their flocks, not only to be solicitous for their personal salvation, but likewise to pursue those measures which will secure the present and future well-being of those intrusted to their care; in order that they may, as far as possible, bring them into a state of religious subjection, and establish them in the great doctrines and truths of the Gospel, that they at last may stand with them accepted by God in the presence of his Son, Jesus Christ. And, though other duties may require only a limited portion of our attention, these demand the undivided and assiduous exercise of all the powers and energies of the mind.

"For this very reason it is, most reverend, illustrious, and learned gentlemen, that we, also, to whom is committed not only the care of our own souls, but the welfare and instruction of those Churches and flocks over which we have been appointed pastors by the Lord Jesus Christ, believe that the office we have thus received, and which we wish to adorn, requires us to guard with the utmost care and diligence the purity of the religion of our Divine Redeemer; lest by any neglect of ours any thing should be allowed to be appended to it which would tend to deface its beauty, and stamp its loveliness with deformity. And therefore we have endeavoured to prevent our congregations from having their minds imbued with those doctrines the tendency of which is to weaken, and by degrees to destroy, a just veneration and esteem for the sanctity and purity of our holy religion.

"By religion we mean the existence of correct views of God, and Jesus Christ as Mediator, associated with sincere devotion and genuine obedience, founded upon this knowledge. And, as the latter prepares the mind for devotion, so it is the duty of the minister to endeavour to promote it, although it is not absolutely of equal importance with the other: for, though ignorance may be inimical to the growth of true religion, yet it is possible that *mere* ignorance may not destroy the sincerity of obedience and devotion. But where there is the absence of devotion, such a state is marked by the want of that holiness to which is annexed the promise of eternal life; for, indeed, there are some errors, the offspring of ignorance, which may not be injurious to the spirit of devotion, inasmuch as they are uninfluential on the feelings and character of their subject. It follows, therefore, that he who is determined to be offended with, and condemn, simple ignorance and unintentional error, not only assails that which is not absolutely evil, but verily attacks human nature itself; for where is the person who, in his investigations of sacred and Divine subjects, will pretend to be exempt from all liability to err. Nay, indeed, that man has not yet been born who has always been so invariably guided by the dictate of reason and truth as never to have overstepped the boundaries of the one, or passed beyond the limits of the other. True it is, there are certain important doctrines which must ever be acknowledged as fundamentals in religion, on which the whole superstructure of piety is founded. These, it is granted, must be held inviolably sacred, inasmuch as they contribute in no small degree to give validity to its claims and requirements, and, consequently, the undermining or loosening of these cannot be viewed with indifference by him to whom the character and claims of Divine truth are dear and interesting. Concerning the safety of these, his conscience is tender and sensitive, prompting him to exercise holy jealousy, and instinctively to resist and repel any invasion upon them, just as the eye, when wounded by the intrusion of the slightest particle of dust, instantly endeavours to free itself from the consequent pain by making efforts to discharge and expel it.

"And that you may distinctly understand the reason of our making these assertions, most illustrious and learned gentlemen, we beg leave to state that we have witnessed the introduction of certain opinions among us, which, though supported by the names of persons otherwise justly honoured for their endowments and attainments, and whose erudition has deservedly exalted them to the highest stations, are, nevertheless, we believe, false in their principles, and injurious in their tendency; and have been as unjustly introduced into, as they have been violently supported in our Churches. The truth of this assertion we think it is easy to demonstrate, from the fact of these doctrines being incompatible with the honour of Divine wisdom—the justice, the benevolence, and φιλανθρωπιą, philanthropy of our Saviour—the satisfaction and merit of his death—the declarations of God's holy word—the sanctity of the Christian ministry—the use of the holy sacraments—and the obligations of the Christian. And, moreover, they are an occasion of offence to the truly devout; an indelible stain on the Reformation; and powerfully operate to prevent the diffusion of vital and practical godliness. Finally, they furnish our adversaries with weapons to assail us on every side, and thereby hold up to contempt and reproach that Reformation so gloriously commenced, and carried on under such singularly favourable auspices.

"But that which has most directly affected us, is the circumstance that these doctrines, which appear on the otherwise fair countenance of our Church as unsightly blemishes and offensive spots, have been pointed at by our enemies with the finger of scorn, and scoffed at by the tongue of reproach, as though they were the inherent and natural defects of her constitution. And while these unjust, because ill founded, reproaches were keenly felt by us, we judged it right to attempt, to the utmost of our ability, to remove the occasion of them. To effect this, we determined that the highly objectionable private opinions of such doctors should not be allowed to pass as the acknowledged doctrines of our Churches, or, at least, of those under our own immediate care and instruction.*

"These our laudable designs and efforts we had judged would merit well of the Church; but, alas! they have operated to produce just the contrary result. For while endeavouring thus to remedy evils, and effect a cure by the application of salutary means, we found that we had only attacked the symptoms of the distemper on the surface of the body, and, in this way, had driven the malignant humours upon the vital parts, which, spreading inflammatory disease through the whole system, had excited a universally morbid state of action, which threatened its speedy and inevitable dissolution.

"These results we neither designed, foresaw, nor approved, and therefore are not justly blamable for them. On the contrary, though we failed in our benevolent purpose, yet the very attempt to preserve the reputation of the Church uninjured, and free from all those charges of defect which have been so frequently brought against it, demands the homage of every lover of our Divine religion. And we put it to this venerable assembly to say, whether it should be a matter of crimination against a person, and especially a faithful minister of Jesus Christ, who, when he learns with pain that some few persons are endeavouring to force their own peculiar and obnoxious opinions on the Church, should manfully come forward to prevent it. To your calm and sober examination, honourable and reverend gentlemen, we leave this appeal with all its force of evidence and truth, for your judgment and decision. And we beg leave to say, that while the circumstance it states has met with violence and opposition, we can only attribute such conduct to the prejudiced and perverted spirit of the age. But though our motives have been misunderstood, and our benevolent purpose has failed, yet we do not repent that we made the effort; but, on the contrary, we esteem it our highest glory to bear the reproach and enmity of our cotemporaries while striving to accomplish so glorious an object. This state of mind is the result of a conviction that we were bound to adopt the measures we pursued; unless, indeed, we had been willing to be ranked by our heavenly Master as cowards and traitors in his great and blessed cause. And though we admitted the possibility of not being able to effect our purpose, yet we saw that there was something honourable and dignified even in a failure, where an attempt was made to achieve an object so noble in itself, and which, as we conceived, would be attended with beneficial and lasting results. Let then our counsels be finally rejected, and our plans discarded, still shall we retire sustained by this sentiment, that to him who intends well, especially as regards the prosperity of the Church, is due the praise of forming a benevolent design, though he should be subject to scorn as a pestilent innovator. If, indeed, it should be thought by any of this venerable assembly, that our proceedings appear indicative of a spirit of innovation, let it be understood that the evils we intended to remedy were of too great magnitude to allow us either to sit and silently witness their destructive effects, or touch them with a slight and delicate hand. Neither ought you, illustrious and learned gentlemen, to receive as true the reports which have been so industriously spread among the common people, to the great injury of our character and prejudice of our cause, by which it has been stated that we have attacked the celebrated persons alluded to merely on account of trifles, thereby manifesting a disputatious and contentious spirit, and have directed all our efforts to the accomplishment of objects which are insignificant, trifling, and unimportant. Nay, rather, God forbid! that God whom we serve in spirit and in truth! that we should ever be prompted by the mere caprice of our own will, to enter into controversy with any one on unimportant matters in religion; and so be led to treat that which is in itself insignificant as of the greatest moment; or that we should have pleasure in seeking to split hairs, and brandish the weapons of contention for the mere purposes of disputation and strife. For it is the peculiar feature of a truly Christian mind to be affected only by those things which are deeply momentous and serious; neither will the mere prudent man allow himself to be easily drawn into a contest for a vain and empty shadow; while on the part of the devout and pious there will be the avoidance, as far as possible, of all occasion of contention and discord; while to dispute about points that are unessential to our salvation only belongs to a mind governed by rashness and folly.

---

* So early as the year 1594, at a convention of States at Ratisbone, the divines of the palatinate were accused, by the Lutherans, of holding opinions neither consonant with the Scriptures, the Augustine Confession, nor with their own catechism."—*Clark's Marrow of Eccles. Hist.* p. 916.

"Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we think the treatment we have met with, in being held up to receive the brand of public odium, and reproach, as unjust in those who have manifested it, as it has been unmerited in us who have been subject to it. But all this proves to us the difficulty and danger of endeavouring to remove existing evils, or to expose erroneous opinions, the more especially when they have received the sanction of authority, and the support of distinguished names.

"Did we need proof of this, we have only to refer to the result of our efforts. For from the moment we made the attempt, there have raged against us, if I may use so harsh a phrase, the most violent passions; and we have been treated as the avowed enemies of the Reformation, opponents of the truth, disturbers of the public tranquillity, traitors to our country, and the patrons and advocates of every species of heresy; while the most malignant calumnies and foulest reproaches have been made use of, for the purpose of involving us in infamy and disgrace. Hence our character and reputation have alike been assailed, both from the pulpit and the press, and by base and false reports we have been represented as the most vile and unworthy persons, so that we may adopt the language of the apostle and say, that we have become *περιψημα και καθαρμα του κοσμου, the filth and offscouring of the world.* To attempt to prove the correctness of this statement is unnecessary, since the measures adopted against us during the last ten years, in the face of heaven and in the sight of the whole United Provinces, place its truth beyond a doubt. The facts thus alluded to are so notorious that it is utterly impossible for any person to be ignorant of them; nay, the very walls of our churches, the pews, the pulpits, and the aisles—the public places of resort, the markets, the streets, and private assemblies—not only declare, but proclaim them aloud, as every mechanic and vagabond of the *canaille* can testify.

"In the first instance, suspicions were secretly excited against us through the medium of dark insinuations and inuendoes, which acted like hidden poison, secretly generating mistrust and jealousy in the minds of those who had been accustomed to regard us only with confidence and esteem. For so true is it, that suspicion is the first poisoner of friendship. These measures eventually prepared the way to alienate from us the affections of those who formerly loved us as their own souls. Afterward we were more openly and publicly attacked, and though the charges alleged against us were false and frivolous, yet they served to excite the minds of men so violently, that they seemed to be acted upon as by inflammable matter, till they were wrought up to a high degree of rage and frenzy. and while in this state of irritation, the flames of hatred and animosity were fanned to a still higher degree by public discourses, principally composed of combustible materials, tending to spread the fire of dissension and strife, we were in consequence vilified, slandered, taunted, scoffed, and abused with every species of reproach; till, the bounds of courtesy, decency, and civility being past, every one was left to utter, without the least restraint or hinderance, that which the dictates of his depraved feelings suggested, as on persons who had justly merited to be treated as the victims of public hatred and insult. And thou, most blessed Jesus! what things hast thou not heard and seen from thy throne, which have either been done to us or laid to our charge, though we have neither merited the one nor been guilty of the other! How often have our sighs and groans ascended to thee in the heavens, yea, and how frequently and ardently have we poured forth our souls unto thee, to whom we are assured our innocency is fully known! We call thee to witness, thou Divine Redeemer and Searcher of the heart, who shalt judge the living and the dead, whether we ever gave to any one just cause thus to load us with calumny, charge us with crime, and treat us with contumely, insult, and injury!

"Not that we make these statements, most reverend and learned sirs, with the design of its being understood that, amid the general excitement which has prevailed, all we have done or written has been perfectly faultless. For although we are fully persuaded of the justice, goodness, and truth of our cause, nevertheless, we know how difficult it is, when the mind is agitated by storms and tempests, so to govern it that all its purposes and actings may be such as to be free from defect and blame. Gentlemen, we are men, and therefore we pretend not to be exempt from the imperfections incident to our common nature. But this much we boldly assert, that nothing was designed, desired, hoped, or attempted by us, as justly meriting the public odium with which we have been treated.

"To prevent, therefore, the permanent abidence of these revolting opinions in our Churches, and their consequent effects in operating to produce disunion among us, has been the great object of all our solicitudes, counsels, and designs. In this, it is true, we have been opposed by many. Nevertheless, let it be understood, that in all we have written, said, or done, the great object we proposed was no other than that of defending our most flourishing Church, part of the body of Jesus Christ, our holy and blessed Redeemer, from the principles of dissension and disunion—a Church which was planted and nurtured at the expense of so much toil, suffering, and labour, and which flourished amid the contentions and struggles of war, the agitations of the republic, and the slaughter and butchery of so many innocent persons; and was cemented by the blood of its most venerable and devoted martyrs. Endeared to us as it is by so many interesting events, we endeavoured to prevent its being disfigured by any new schisms, or painfully rent and destroyed while yet in a state of comparative infancy. We therefore repeat it, that the attainment of this object has been the subject of all our prayers and sighs before almighty God, and the end to which all our anxieties have for a long time been directed; and to prevent any deep and painful wound from being inflicted upon it, we have, in conjunction with the most heroic of our countrymen, contributed our utmost efforts. This we did under a persuasion that, if inflicted, it might not be in the power of Hippocrates himself to heal it, much less any of his most favoured followers. For the history of events, whether relating to past or modern times, teaches us that a wound, though produced by a trifling cause, and only slight in its character, may nevertheless be extremely difficult to cure; while the greater delay in the application of the remedy renders the case more dangerous; and, if cured at all, it leaves behind an indelible and unsightly scar.

"Therefore, to prevent this evil, we frequently petitioned our governors, entreating their high mightinesses to condescend to adopt one of the three following measures: namely, that a synod should be convoked according to the provisions appointed by the States; but if this did not appear eligible, on account of the recent and greatly agitated state of the public mind, by which its judgment was warped, and its decisions vitiated, in that case we proposed that *mutual toleration* should be established, and that each person should be allowed undisturbed to maintain his own sentiments on the disputed points; it being distinctly understood, that when stating his views upon them, he should not overstep the bounds of sobriety, modesty, and piety; and that matters should be suffered to remain in this state until some other means was appointed to meet the exigency of the times; and, finally, if neither of the above measures was found practicable, and the peace and safety of our country could not be preserved but by our ceasing to be considered as authorized pastors of the state, we declared our willingness to submit to an edict that might require us to relinquish the functions of our offices, and the churches where we had ministered, and to provide for ourselves in the best way we could. For we had much rather secure the peace and welfare of our country by being personally subject to sacrifices and sufferings, than injure its interests and prosperity, by maintaining our right to officiate in its pulpits and sanctuaries. And we appeal to you, most honourable gentlemen, reverend and learned brethren, whether any thing, in our circumstances, could have been proposed more equitable, honourable, and disinterested. That we should abandon our sentiments, or disavow the profession of them, our consciences would not permit. To desist from the discharge of our public ministry, unbidden by our superiors, would be to merit the brand of being deserters and mercenary hirelings.

"The calling of a synod was opposed by those who rejected the clause of the resolution of the States, directing the examination and revision of the Confession and Catechism. What then could be done, but that we should advise the appointment of mutual toleration? As to the assertions of those who maintain that a synod might long since have been assembled but for our opposition, we aver that they slander us, and do us great injustice. On the contrary, we not only cheerfully concurred with, but recommended the decree of the States of Holland and West Friesland, and also that of the States-General on this subject; and nothing would have been more agreeable to our views and wishes than the convocation of a synod according to the letter of these resolutions; while the period chosen for its assembling was of all others the most opportune, inasmuch as the minds of men were not then excited by contentions and disputes, nor their judgments influenced beyond that of contemplating the points in debate as mere matters of private opinion. Neither had any secession taken place on account of them. No alienation of affection existed in one person against another, on account of their differing in opinion on these subjects. But at this period there were individuals who, according to our judgments, without any justifiable reasons, objected and threw impediments in the way of the meeting of this synod. Nothing was left to us, then, but to urge the adoption of a plan for mutual toleration, which we think ought to have been conceded, not in the least doubting that when the feverish excitement of men's minds, occasioned by contentions, had begun to subside, and the attendant angry feeling was allayed by the meliorating influence of time, that then peace and amity would be restored. Of the possibility of retaining so desirable an object we were fully convinced, not only from the example of distinguished persons, but also of whole Churches, who preserved unimpaired the bonds of fellowship and Christian brotherhood, although they allowed a diversity of opinion not merely on the points now in dispute, but likewise on various others. And instead of such forbearance and toleration being injurious to these Churches, they were found greatly to contribute to their peace and prosperity. In proof of the correctness of this statement, we may refer not only to the conduct of Theodore Beza toward James Andrew, but also to that of our own Churches, which have held out the *tessera*, or right hand of fellowship, to those of the Lutheran communion. And, finally, we may add, in vindication of such a measure, the authority of the opinion of his most gracious majesty, the king of Great Britain, who urged the adoption of it, while the united voices and advice of the most eminent theologians and doctors of our own time were equally in favour of it. But all our attempts to obtain mutual toleration not only failed, but, what is still more singular, that in the degree we endeavoured to induce men to cultivate the spirit of forbearance and brotherly charity, in that same degree they became more violent in opposing it. Indeed, there were certain persons who carried their opposition to it so far as to show it in seditious harangues, violent addresses from the pulpit, and inflammatory publications from the press, all designed to act on the public mind, for the purpose of indisposing men to form a correct view of the principles of this toleration; while they insinuated that the Remonstrants only intended to use it as a προφασις, or a pretext which was to veil their covert designs, and serve as a γλαυκωμα, or dimning medium, to darken the vision, and hide from the less keen-sighted the base designs which were shaded under this covering, and which they ultimately intended to accomplish. And to give greater weight to these misrepresentations, they asserted that the Remonstrants acted the part of certain statesmen, who, to effect their object, adapt their opinions and actings to the changing aspect of the times; and that in the government of their consciences they had rendered them so pliant as to be able to accommodate them to their purpose, as the mariner can alter and veer around the sails to every shifting wind;—a charge so base and atrocious manifests the malignity and wickedness of those who could invent it, while we challenge our enemies to point out any thing in our conduct that can furnish them with the slightest reasons for such an accusation.

"Such measures acted, as we are wont to say, like oil upon fire, and kindled the flames of contention to the highest degree, so that persons who had hitherto been neutral and untainted by party feeling, were now excited by jealousy, and subsequently became so alienated from us that all our efforts to prevent their being hurried into open schism were ineffectual, which, when once it had taken place, acted like a signal to others, who, becoming similarly excited, produced an almost universal and simultaneous movement, which, in spite of all the efforts made use of by the government to prevent dissensions and promote the peace of our country, spread rapidly through the cities, towns, and villages. Amid these commotions, the persons most intent upon creating them, being desirous of showing that the agitation was not the result of a plan adopted by uninfluential persons, invited the principal individuals in most of the provinces to associate, and give their countenance to these schisms, and thereby impress the stamp of legitimacy on such unnatural productions. And we wish it to be understood by this synod, that these unlawful associations, in which the spirit of schism and disunion was cherished, were patronized by the clergy, who in no small numbers pledged themselves to promote, as far as possible, secessions from the Church, on the alleged ground that the doctrines of the Remonstrants were all and each of them opposed to the dictate of truth, prejudicial to the glory of God, and destructive to piety and genuine peace of conscience. And all this was done, sirs, with a declared expectation that such measures would be sanctioned by the general consent and approval of this national synod.

"That these proceedings did not originate with the people, was unnecessary for the parties to attempt to prove. For when was it ever known that the *mobile vulgus* undertook any measures, either for producing commotions or effecting important changes, unless excited by some governing minds, and directed by the influence and authority of some distinguished names, it being like the sea whose waters remain placid and calm till agitated and tossed by the violence of tempestuous winds? Neither were the circumstances which accompanied such a state of things, of that character as to allow of doubt on the subject, inasmuch as there were certain persons, eminent in station and influence, who, while they pretended to admit that such measures were illegal and injurious, and highly displeasing to them, yet never once publicly manifested this displeasure against the authors and promoters of these secessions; while others, pluming themselves on their sagacity, were determined to seek a pretext for their approval of these proceedings, and soon invented one as an apology for their conduct. This was effected by their professing to have discovered that, under the points embraced by the Remonstrants, there were veiled horrible and damnable dogmas, which being joined with errors that had formerly agitated the Church, were about to be revived under a new form, and would, with every other species of heresy which had been exploded, most certainly be advanced and sophistically defended.

"In consequence of these declarations an inquisitorial spirit awoke, and a species of vigilant scrutiny was adopted, under which was noticed and criticised every word and expression we uttered. Nay, so far was this carried, that tribunals were instituted, where not only our words, but the very letters and syllables of which they were composed, with the intonations of our voices, were subject to animadversion, while the least departure in controversy from the usual phraseology became an occasion of suspicion, it being asserted that under such deviations were hidden embryo errors, lurking as serpents and other reptiles are wont to do under stones. Not only so, but our private conversations or public communications were sifted, and from these were collected words and expressions which, in their single and separate state, were light and trivial, but by being seen in a collected form were made to appear important and deserving of attention. Thus, in whatever way the Remonstrants acted, they were made the objects of suspicion and mistrust. Were they silent—this was said to be the result of that cunning which was fostering some dark and dangerous design. Were they open and frank—then they were branded with being insolent and contumacious, while all they said and did was exaggerated and held up to public view under the strongest colourings of hyperbole.

"Gentlemen, we are not calling upon you to admit the truth of these declarations upon our bare word, but we wish to direct your attention to a late publication, entitled, *A Specimen of the Controversies of the Low Countries*, and especially to that part of it which relates to the Remonstrants; and, unless we are greatly mistaken, you will concur in what we have asserted, while we are fully persuaded that a future period will place the correctness of our statements still more fully beyond the shadow of doubt.

"In the meantime we beg leave to assure you, gentlemen, that the various charges alleged against us, and exhibited with so much colouring and sophistry, are founded on falsehood and misrepresentation; and we are bold to assert that if you will read and closely investigate all or any of our writings, there will nowhere be found in them any just occasion for the bitter calumnies and accusations brought against us. For who, indeed, among us has ever touched in the slightest manner the *ακροθινια*, or *essentials* of Christianity, much less attempted to undermine and subvert them? And we declare that we will not yield to any of your reverences in decided attachment and devotion to all those points upon which the Church is universally agreed. And that you may know the true, though not the alleged ground of these charges against us, we say that it is no other than that of our not imitating the conduct of some who, we think, have presumptuously spoken on some of the mysteries of Divine revelation in a way that shows that they have forgotten that secret things belong to God. And the reason of our thus acting is, from a persuasion that he has taken the safer course who, when treating of the deep mysteries of our holy religion, has cherished a spirit of modesty and diffidence, and admitted that there are certain points of truth in theology which are to be acknowledged as placed above our comprehension, and therefore to be received as matters of faith, and not of speculation; and when treated upon should be represented, as far as possible, in the words and terms of Scripture. And we have been led to the adoption of these sentiments, and a corresponding practice, from a conviction founded upon observation, that the descent toward error becomes more rapid the nearer that speculation approaches to these abstruse and sacred mysteries; and that a single trip in the downward course frequently becomes the occasion of the mind being hurried into the reception of the most fatal errors. We have, therefore, studiously avoided entering into disputations on these veiled and profound subjects; being fully persuaded that in all points of this kind it is much the safer way to admit them as matters of implicit belief, than to introduce them as topics for discussion and definition; and that they are never to be approached but with mingled feelings of reverence and humility; and to be touched, as we are wont to say, only with untainted and hallowed hands. Yea, more, the moment any thing is appended by way of ornament to the native majesty and dignity of these sublime mysteries, their ineffable glory and beauty are shaded by such colourings and decorations of human contrivance; proving that to appear in all their commanding features they must be allowed to stand forth in the sublime simplicity of their own native dignity, unaccompanied by man's inventions and additions. Where such a course is not pursued, and persons are disposed to deal in definitions and descriptions on these subjects, it is customary for them to call in the aid of reason in accomplishing their purposes, which, in return for the assistance she affords, demands that no point shall be admitted as true till examined at her tribunal, where she asserts that that alone is worthy of credence which can be maintained according to her decisions. Hence have sprung all the vast and varied questions in relation to these deep subjects, forming at once a strange medley of rashness, incredulity, and impiety, on which, if an individual dare to venture, he ought to know that he does it at the risk of being borne down the stream of speculation, amid rocks, whirlpools, gulfs, and quicksands, where he will most likely suffer the wreck of that bending awe and hallowed simplicity necessary to maintain unimpaired the spirit of humble reliance and religious devotion.

"On other topics where the essentials of religion are not involved, greater latitude of sentiment and expression is allowed, as is evident from the rules and practice adopted in our universities and other public institutions for learning, where such points are debated to the utmost nicety. On these subjects it is well known the learned have always held a variety of opinions, a circumstance which was never supposed to endanger their salvation. And to attempt to fix a standard of judgment in such cases, and frame a species of vocabulary by which every word and phrase are to be regulated, is to forge bonds and fetters for the mind, to which it is impossible that it should submit; while that diversity of opinion on unessential points allowed in the Church is opposed to it. Besides, such a system of restriction as requires implicit deference to the dictum of others, would render truth itself vapid and insipid, by destroying that vividness of feeling ever attendant on an ardent and unrestrained pursuit of knowledge. We have, therefore, always maintained that a degree of latitude in discussion may be allowed, both as to sentiment and mode of expression, where the essentials of truth are not in question.

"Neither, indeed, can we hide it from ourselves, that the happy period never yet existed in which there was uniformity of opinion among men on every point of doctrine. If we go to the infancy of the Christian Church, and from thence pass to the blessed times of the early fathers down to our own age, the history of these various periods will prove that, throughout the whole of them, a diversity of judgment was not only maintained, but also the liberty of stating and defending opposite sentiments was fully recognized; it being admitted that the exercise of such a privilege was by no means detrimental to Christian fellowship and the welfare of the Church. And so far was the right of private judgment asserted and acted upon by the ancients, that there was scarcely a single point of doctrine on which they did not differ from each other, and as freely state that difference. But it is not necessary that we should go to such remote times to justify our statements, while the practices of the Churches of England, France, and Germany, as also those of our own country, and of almost every other, are in direct proof of the correctness of them. And we may boldly demand of this august assembly to point out the place or spot in Christendom where perfect uniformity of thinking has obtained. And when we take into the account the diversity in the capacity of men's minds, the variety of subjects which come under their inspection, with the abstruse character of some of them, and the difference of mediums through which they are contemplated, we say, that to endeavour to force men into perfect unanimity under such circumstances, is as Herculean and hopeless a task as was that of Nero to cut a passage through the Isthmus of Corinth. Hence we can but concur in the sentiments of the illustrious and learned Paræus, when he states, 'that the greater part of the ancient heresies, as well as the present dissensions in the Church, may be attributed chiefly to the circumstance of councils, bishops, and doctors having obtruded upon the consciences of the people, without distinction, the doctrines of the schools and the dogmas of the universities as articles of the Christian faith, declaring the admission of them to be absolutely necessary to salvation; with a pertinacious readiness to find occasion to brand as heretical the slightest deviation from the usually received mode of interpreting Scripture.'

"These measures would necessarily be followed by consequences such as had been stated, under similar circumstances, by Hilary to the Emperor Constantine; namely, that when persons begin to contend about words,—to differ about names,—debate on ambiguous terms,—fiercely dispute concerning authority,—and perpetually seek occasion for strife, and yet urge the necessity of uniformity, each begins to anathematize the other, while Christ is forsaken by all.

"Reverend and learned sirs, we state these particulars in order that you may understand how unjustly we have been suspected of intending to overturn the present order of things in the Church, and to introduce a strange medley into religion; and that by such means we sought to bring a kind of theology into our pulpits and universities marked with the characters of pyrrhonism and latitudinarianism; yea, and that under the pretence of securing the right of private judgment and the liberty of prophesying, we purposed to establish a species of unrestrained freedom, through which we should be at liberty to follow the caprice of our own imaginations, and to teach whatever we pleased, without the least check or restraint. Gentlemen, believe us, we never designed, sought, or wished any thing like this, but only desired that liberty which forms the golden medium between a state of slavery and licentiousness. For as, on the one hand, we are not of those who are fickle and wavering, and on every trifling occasion given to change; neither can we, on the other, forbear testifying our disapprobation of those who basely and servilely submit their thinkings to the judgment of others, to whose opinions, in all things, they pertinaciously adhere like leeches, and consider the deviation of a hair's breadth from the sentiments of those whom they have made their oracles, as the sin of schism, or an evil of such magnitude, the guilt of which is not to be expiated. Such persons undoubtedly evince their wisdom in thus implicitly following the decisions of others, because they are usually incapable of forming an opinion of their own, and therefore are like oxen and bears, which are led by the nose at the will and pleasure of their masters.

"Sustained by a conviction of the purity of our motives, the justice of our cause, and the approval of our consciences, we have hitherto borne up against every sort of injury and calumny to which we have been subject, acting upon the maxim of Augustine, that where conscience is satisfied, it is unnecessary to attempt to satisfy calumny.

"The attitude we thus assume on this occasion is the result of this consciousness of rectitude in motive and purpose in all our actings; and, therefore, supported by such a state of mind, we readily, and without having been cited, repaired some days since to this place. It is true, as to myself, I appear in this assembly in obedience to the commands of those, whose authority to acknowledge is held by me as a sacred duty. But whether we are to be considered on this occasion in the character of cited persons, or otherwise, shall not be debated by me at present, it being of little importance, provided that in the business to be determined upon, there is evinced by this assembly that fidelity in the discharge of its high functions which becomes those who, in judging on such momentous matters, show that they are guided rather by the desire of vindicating *truth*, than of obtaining a *victory*. And, gentlemen, we cannot refrain asserting that the presence of so many renowned and learned foreigners from almost every part of Christendom, has not a little contributed thus to embolden and inspire us with the hope of a favourable result to our cause and interests. The principal reason for our cherishing this hope is, the persuasion that such persons are prepared to enter upon the examination of the matters in dispute between us and our opponents, with more calmness of spirit, benignity of temper, and exemption from party prejudice and interest, than those who have allowed themselves to be precipitately hurried by their feelings so far as to proceed in contempt of all authority, and without any precedent or ecclesiastical decision, to erase our names from their church books; and who, upon their own authority, have created and cherished an open schism and separation from us.

"Under these circumstances need we say to you, gentlemen foreigners, but brother Christians and ministers, that such persons are not as capable of entering into the matters before them as those who have stood remote from the scene of contest and excitement. For, in the very nature of things, he who has committed himself upon any point at issue between contending parties, so as publicly to declare his judgment on one side of the question, before the whole merits of the case have been examined, certainly cannot come into court as a competent judge. Nevertheless, be it known unto you, learned gentlemen, that there are some who are here to sit as our judges who have espoused certain opinions which they deem sacred, and refuse to hold communion with others who may, in the slightest manner, depart from them. I put it, then, to you, to say, whether these persons can be equitable judges, who are thus either the slaves of their own opinions, or of those which they have adopted from others.

"Being thus situated, to you it is, most reverend and learned men and brethren, that our hopes are directed as judges in our cause. And since you have subjected yourselves to the inconvenience of journeying to this place, for the purpose of aiding this most august assembly with your prudent counsels, pious suggestions, devout prayers, and impartial suffrages, we cannot refrain from appealing to you in all humility and earnestness, beseeching you, by the pity and passion, the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, our common Saviour and Divine Redeemer, by all that is venerable and holy in that name by which you with ourselves have been called, by whatsoever is dear to your own souls, by all the sympathies of Christian brotherhood, the bonds of holy fellowship, and the obligations of mutual forbearance, that you do not suffer yourselves, most reverend brethren, to be influenced in your decisions by any statements made concerning us, beyond that which we now publicly and in verity may hereafter profess before you; and especially that you would not take, as the ground of your judgment, what may have been blamable either in the writings or acting of any private person among us, inasmuch as the whole of us are not to be made responsible for the faults and defects of any individual. And indeed yourselves will admit that he who would impartially judge in any cause, must not allow himself to be guided by that which is on its surface, or forms a mere accident in the case, but will deem it obligatory upon him, vigilantly and circumspectly to examine the whole subject, for the purpose of ascertaining its general features, that, by a comprehensive view of it, he may be enabled to mark its true character, with the scope and design of the parties engaged therein. And whatever is foreign to these, though accidentally associated with them, he will reject, not suffering them to influence his mind in the decision to which he shall come.

"The whole that we have professed and declared, and to which we would especially direct your attention, may be compendiously summed up under three heads.

"In the first place, we frankly confess that we have endeavoured publicly to oppose those persons who have entertained certain sentiments on the subject of predestination, and other doctrines connected with it, which they themselves have not scrupled to designate as *horrida*, or horrible, and which the Synod of Gelderland recently pronounced as being 'the abominable and detestable opinions of certain doctors.' Nevertheless, though they originated with, and were only held by these persons, they have, however, had the effrontery to maintain that they are the true and genuine doctrines of all our Churches, and as such are to be received and professed.

"Secondly, that, as we disapproved from our very souls, so we constantly and publicly opposed the conduct of those persons who, without the slightest warrant, and antecedently to any synodical decree or determination, did upon their own authority assert the expediency and lawfulness of separation from us, on account of what are called the five articles maintained by us, and who either virtually adopted measures to prepare the way for schisms, or, when they had taken place, either publicly advocated or silently cherished them by refusing to show any marks of disapprobation on account of them.

"Thirdly, that we have always condemned the injustice and bigotry of those persons who, although the great fundamentals of religion were preserved inviolate, have, nevertheless, been anxious to suspect, and forward to brand, as an unpardonable act of heresy, the slightest deviation in the mode of representing subjects universally acknowledged to be nonessential, and have deemed the least departure from the opinion of this or that celebrated doctor as an evil of such magnitude as to render the subject of it, if not altogether unworthy of Christian communion, yet, at least, as having forfeited all right to fraternity and fellowship with the Reformed Churches.

"To these subjects may be added another point of debate growing out of these very controversies, that is, the right and extent of the authority of the Christian magistrate in ecclesiastical affairs. And while it has been the practice of some persons to derogate from his right of interference and judgment in religious matters, they have, on the other hand, exacted a species of blind submission and reverence to all ecclesiastical mandates and decrees; while we, on our part, have ever been accustomed to identity with the office of the magistrate, the highest species of authority in all such affairs.

"From this statement will be seen the objects we proposed, namely, the prevention of evils which we considered and still consider of such importance as to demand our decided opposition. Neither did we believe that we could satisfy our consciences, or meet the obligations imposed upon us by our office, unless we did, by every justifiable effort within our power, endeavour to prevent their baneful and destructive influence. For we consider that of all those cares which demand the attention of the ministers of Jesus Christ, none are of greater importance than the two following. In the first place, that they ought most vigilantly to guard against any thing which might be detrimental to the great principles and requirements of piety and holiness, lest the sanctity of the character of the Christian religion should be injured, and its saving influence be thereby limited. And, secondly, to oppose the spirit of schism, which, on every trifling difference in opinion, would instantly proceed to create separations in the Church, and consequently to destroy its peace and unity.

"Thus to guard the purity, and preserve the harmony of the Church, we have contended with all our might, ever considering these as *ancilia*, or shields let down from heaven, in order to secure its welfare and perpetuity; and we are fully persuaded that those measures which tend to effect these objects will meet with the approbation and protection of our great and common Lord.

"Should other matters of a grave and serious character be alleged against us to your reverences and lordships, we most earnestly entreat you to suspend your judgment on such charges, until you have heard both sides of the question, and then in giving your verdict upon the evidence as brought before you, all we ask is, that you will deal unto us in the same manner as you would expect to be dealt with by us, were you in our circumstances. More than this we wish not, and more we ask not, and if this be granted, then we are sure that you will approach the matters in debate with unbiassed and unprejudiced minds. If this be the case, our being charged with crime will be no proof to you of its reality; for if to be accused of wrong is the proof of it, then who can be declared innocent? Flattery, sirs, toward you we have not used, and to court your esteem and favour we have not attempted, nor, indeed, do we intend it, because we are fully assured that our cause requires not the support of any man thus obtained; while, on the other hand, so to gain it might involve the sacrifice of conscience, an evil for which it would be a vain compensation. No, sirs, it is the favour of our supreme Judge alone which we would humbly seek, to whose righteous tribunal we know that we are amenable, and by whose award we intend to stand or fall. These our public declarations are the result of conscious innocence, which if we cannot make to appear to our enemies, we at least hope to do to the mind of every reasonable and serious man; and therefore we shall appeal to the judgment and conscience of the devout and pious in every place. In making these assertions we are neither ignorant of, nor unimpressed with the fact, that the awful day is rapidly approaching, when we shall have to stand before that God who, as the Judge of our spirits, will bring to light the hidden secrets of the heart.

"Gentlemen, we wish you not to judge of our case by the smallness of the number now present to defend it. One advocate is sufficient for the vindication of a good cause, while the presence of a multitude is not capable of justifying a bad one. And, indeed, we declare that, if to the defence of ourselves numbers had been requisite equal to the formation of a synod, these could have readily been found. Nay, more, we are fully satisfied, that did it become us as Christians to boast of our numbers, or had we been permitted to appear with an equal array of strength in this contest, we have a host who would willingly appear at our bidding. But to prevent our standing in this assembly in such an imposing attitude, and to throw the shade of insignificancy and contempt over our cause, recourse has been had to such tricks, such manœuvres, double dealing, and abominable deceptiveness, which, though I should blush to name them here, have, nevertheless, been fully witnessed by the all-seeing eye of God.

"This much, however, we shall not forbear to state,—that, in order to render our numbers small and diminutive, schisms and dissensions were everywhere promoted among us, and that very frequently by the intrigues of a few individuals. Pastors also, who were highly esteemed and beloved by their flocks, were ejected from their Churches. This was done prior to the calling of the provincial synods, in order that they might be prevented from voting in these assemblies. Others, who were appointed to attend them in the character of deputies, had obstacles thrown in the way of their being present, in order that those who might actually be admitted should only appear as a small minority.

"In proof of this take the case of Utrecht, where it is well known the Remonstrants were by far the greater number, living in perfect amity and fellowship with the Contra-Remonstrants until within a very short period of the sittings of the provincial synod, when measures were adopted by a few bigoted spirits to interrupt this harmony, and who, by creating dissensions and separations, accomplished their crafty design of securing the return of an equal number of Contra-Remonstrants to the national synod with that of the Remonstrants.

"But this is a matter of such notoriety as to require no comment from us. We shall, therefore, proceed to another subject of deep and painful interest, and of which we cannot avoid complaining before this assembly: neither, indeed, shall we cease to proclaim the injustice of it in the face of the whole world; that is to say, our being deprived of the assistance of those whom we had such just reason to consider as our leaders, and the bearers of our standards; and that, too, at a period, and under such circumstances, as bespeak the design of it.* And when we allude to these persons as our chiefs and the bearers of our eagles, on whom we so much depended for the defence of our cause, we beg leave to say that they were esteemed as such by us, not so much from the important offices they held among us, as from their prudence, their piety, their age, and their erudition. Should you ask us when this took place? A little before! nay, sirs, the very day previous to its being determined that we should be summoned into the presence of this synod! And thus, at the very moment we were prepared to stand in phalanx to defend ourselves on the matters in dispute, these our chiefs were torn from us. And what is the reason of this treatment? Of this we are ignorant; and can conceive of none, save that which originated with the fact of certain subjects being about to be discussed in this assembly, and on that account it was thought prudent and safe to exclude them. And what is more, at the time we were summoned before this synod upon matters affecting our dearest rights and interests, the ministers who were known to be attached to our sentiments, were, by the delegates of private synods, being loaded with grievous and oppressive Church censures, torn from their flocks, and discharged from their pastoral duties; and this is being done at this very moment, when the business of the synod is proceeding, in which their conduct should be examined into. In vindication of such acts of cruelty and injustice, other reasons than the true one will undoubtedly be assigned, but we know that whatever may be the pretended cause, the real one is that of their being attached to us. This will be seen the more obviously when we state that all those devoted to the opposite party have been treated as being perfectly blameless, and undeserving the slightest reprimand or censure.

---

* Among the persons here alluded to were Uitenbogaerdt and Grevinchovius, who had been suspended from their offices by the synods of South Holland and Delft, as is stated in the following works. *Uitenb. leven*, bl. 239. *En historie*, bl. 123, en 126. *Regenboog's Historie der Remonstranten*, deel i. bl. 340, 341, 349, 350.

"But, though we have been thus unreasonably treated—to designate it by no harsher term—yet we shall not suffer it so to influence us as to induce us to give up our cause, or cast away the weapons of our defence. And, moreover, we are fully resolved, as it becomes Christians, not to admit the truth of any sentiment on the ground of numbers being marshalled on its side, but solely from the force of the arguments with which it is maintained. Scripture, accompanied with sound reason as its *pedissequa*, or handmaid, shall take the advanced position with us in the contest. And in the present instance we are bold to say, that if attempts be made to subdue or silence us by any other weapons than those furnished by the authority of Scripture and sound reasoning, we shall not recede one foot from our position, or be made to admit the justice of such proceedings; and though there may be decrees and decisions fulminated against us, yet, while we have reason and Scripture on our side, we shall stand unmoved though these were pronounced by a tribunal as august and imposing as that of the *centumviri* or the *nongenti*. A wise man is not affected by the number and quality of his judges, but by the truth and equity of the judgment pronounced against him; and conscience, which is especially a man's own judge, declares not its approval or disapproval of the actings of its subject from the number of suffrages which may acquit or condemn him, but by the weight and conclusiveness of the arguments on which the decision is founded. For it is not uncommon, as Seneca justly remarks, that numbers are substituted for arguments, to support a bad cause. When truth, and truth alone, is sought in any investigation, it is only necessary that argument be met with argument, reason with reason, and deduction with deduction.

"If such a proceeding be adopted, which, in the present case, we believe, must commend itself to your reverences as being the most equitable and proper, so it will be matter of great rejoicing to us, our flocks, and our Churches, that such a favourable opportunity is allowed to us of inquiring on which side of the contending parties TRUTH and REASON are arrayed in this synod, honoured as it is by the presence of so many learned and renowned men. And from this assembly we cannot expect less than one of the two following measures:—Either to be allowed to prove the justice and truth of the cause we have hitherto maintained, or, in the event of failing in such an attempt, that then the triumph obtained over us be such as in its results shall prove that it is truth, and truth only, which has been victorious. Then, indeed, shall we be satisfied, and with such a guarantee are we here alike ready to conquer or be conquered; and on whichever side a favourable decision is given, the advantages will be equally beneficial and lasting. For it will then be fully seen, as already admitted, that that man who, in all his inquiries, only proposes as his final object the attainment of that peace and tranquillity of conscience which a knowledge of truth can impart, should he be conquered, still reaps an important advantage, inasmuch as his loss of error is indemnified by the acquisition of truth.

"Finally, we would say that he whose love of justice is not such as to induce him to acquit an enemy if in the possession of truth, or condemn his friend if opposed to it, certainly ought not to sit as judge in this assembly, or give his suffrage on the matters that may come before it. Dear to us, it is true, may be DISTINGUISHED NAMES, DISTINGUISHED PERSONS, and the SANCTITY OF THIS SYNOD, but still more dear to us ought to be the SANCTITY OF TRUTH."

This oration, which was pronounced with much dignity of manner, boldness of character, and distinctness of utterance, was, also, according to our countryman, Hales, marked with the eloquence and action of a fine orator. The delivery of it occupied upward of an hour and a half, and was attended with the most powerful effects upon a numerous audience. Among these were some of the lay delegates, who, though sent there to execute the biddings of Prince Maurice, were, nevertheless, powerfully affected by the statements and touching appeals of Episcopius. The address being ended, the most profound silence followed. An inquisitive gaze marked the looks of the members of the synod, indicative of the uncertainty existing in each mind as to the reply that was to be made to it. At length the president rose, and every eye was instantly directed to him, and all waited with intense anxiety for his intended remarks.

This stern ecclesiastic, who, during the delivery of this address, had writhed under several of the statements made by the speaker, and especially while he was giving his historical details of the conduct of the Contra-Remonstrant party, marked as it had been by injustice, fraud, bigotry, and cruelty, and which he knew could not be denied, was, nevertheless, fully aware of the importance of suppressing his indignation at a moment when he saw the strong impression that had been produced on the minds of the auditors by this powerful oration. He, therefore, commenced his remarks by saying, "that the Remonstrants might now see with what favour and patience the synod treated them, in allowing Episcopius to speak so long, and that, too, without having obtained leave." The professor replied, "that he had previously asked permission, seeing that the introduction of his oration contained a request to be permitted to state some particulars to the synod." Bogerman replied, "But you ought to have waited for the consent of the synod before you proceeded; and, indeed, no one ought to speak here until he has first obtained leave of the synod, and made the president acquainted with the subject of his address." Episcopius merely answered, "that he was ignorant of the existence of such a law." The president, having thus rebuked him, proceeded to say, "that the speech was designed to captivate and prejudice the synod," and added, "that, because it contained many grave statements, he demanded a copy of it to be presented to him, in order that a judgment might be formed, *quo spiritu et genio pronuntiata esset*, with what spirit and design it had been delivered."

Episcopius engaged to comply with this requirement, but added, "that it would be necessary first to make a fair transcript of it, seeing that he had *no fair* copy of it." This statement the reader must bear in mind, along with that of the memorable John Hales, who, in writing the same night to Sir Dudley Carlton, and giving an account of this speech, with the conversation that passed between Episcopius and the president on the subject of presenting a copy of it, distinctly says that Episcopius asserted "*that he had none handsomely written*, [but] if the synod would have patience, he would cause a fair transcript to be drawn out for them. But this excuse would not serve; fair or foul, deliver it up he must, and so he did."

We have now to bring before the reader a transaction growing out of Episcopius' reply, which we can but think highly disreputable, and from which an honourable, to say nothing of a religious, mind would instinctively shrink. It is that of a foul attempt to fix a lie upon Episcopius, by asserting that he had said that he had no *other*, instead of no *fair* copy of his speech. In accomplishing this the lay commissioners, who had recovered from the effects of the sympathy they felt for the Remonstrants, excited by Episcopius' oration, sent for him and asked him, "whether the speech he had pronounced before the synod was principally extemporaneous, or whether it had been carefully precomposed." He replied, "that he had thoroughly premeditated and arranged the matter of it." They then asked him, "if what he had spoken corresponded with the contents of the copy he had presented to the synod." He answered "yes, as to its leading parts; yet he could not pretend to say with certainty that there was not, here and there, some variation between what he had said and what he had written, not having collated the one from which he had spoken with the rough draft of it."* They replied, "that they were aware that professors did not confine themselves to the mere words which they might have previously composed, and, therefore, only wanted to know if the substance of the speech was the same as that contained in the copy he had presented to the president."

All this was to enable them to accomplish the object they had in view; and, judging their way to be clear from what had already passed, it was said, "Pray, do we understand, then, that you have another copy than the one presented to the president?" To which, Episcopius, suspecting nothing, said, "that he had the original draft or sketch of it, but that it was in such a rough state as not to be intelligible to any person but himself." Having carried him to this admission, they judged that they had effected their purpose, and in perfect accordance with their crafty and dishonourable design, they spoke to him in a bland and conciliatory manner, exhorting him to adopt measures to promote peace and amity, and then dismissed him.

We have now to introduce another actor in this scene,—Heinsius, secretary to the lay commissioners. This man, the reader will recollect, is named at page 167 as professor of history in the university of Leyden, and as being associated on terms of intimacy with the Remonstrants, and the particular friend of Episcopius, who, at the same period, occupied the divinity chair in that seat of learning. Aware that his former friend was a man of frank and unsuspecting temper, and availing himself of his past intimacy with him, he told him in a soft and insinuating manner that he had come, at the request of the president of the lay commissioners, to obtain a loan of the rough draft of his speech, intimating that he should be greatly obliged by his compliance with this request. Episcopius, who was incapable of a dishonourable action, and judged of the principles of his former friend by the same standard of rectitude which governed his own, readily complied, on the mere condition that it should be returned to him, not in the least suspecting that he was a party in a plot designed to ruin his character, and destroy his future influence in the synod. Having secured this document, the president and his friends triumphed in the supposition that the means were now furnished to them of presenting Episcopius, and, through him, his cited brethren and the Remonstrants in general in an odious light before the synod and the public; and in this way they hoped that the judgment they intended should be passed on their doctrines, and the condemnation of their ministers would be effected with less sympathy being excited for the latter in the Christian world, seeing that their principles and character might thus be viewed as rendering them worthy of such treatment. So fully aware were Bogerman and his friends of the telling effects that such a charge would have in its blighting influence on the affairs of the cited Remonstrants, that they were led to maintain it with a species of tenacity that could find no parallel, save in the dishonourable feelings that prompted them to advance it.

---

* By this statement we understand that, though Episcopius had the more correct copy before him at the time of delivering his oration, nevertheless, as he spoke chiefly from memory, he thus intimated that the wording of the matter, as it originated in his mind and was inserted in the rough draft, might in some instances have been spoken, from the fact of words which are associated with first impressions recurring to the memory more readily than others which are subsequently substituted for them. And in allusion to this circumstance we conceive it was, that he said he had not collated his corrected copy with the rough draft; and, therefore, was unable to say what was the precise degree of conformity between the speech he delivered and the one presented to the president.

The design of bringing home this charge upon our professor was deferred till the 10th of December. Nevertheless, in the interim a variety of reports were spread through the city, calculated to prepare the public mind to admit its validity. By some it was asserted that the speech he delivered contained several treasonable statements, and that, to avoid the consequences, he had presented a copy to the synod in which they were omitted, retaining the one that contained the objectionable passages; and that, having been detected, the cited ministers were to be severely reprimanded, and Episcopius expelled the synod.

Immediately on the Remonstrants being called into the synod, on the 10th of December, the president pounced upon Episcopius, saying, "Dr. Episcopius, when you were lately commanded to deliver up a copy of your oration, you then said that you had *no other* copy than the one you used at the time you delivered your oration; but it has since been found that you *had another*. I admonish you, therefore, in the name of the synod, henceforth to act with more sincerity and integrity, the more especially as you have no just reason for adopting such deceptive measures to serve your cause." Hereupon Episcopius answered "that he was much obliged to the president for his counsel, and for furnishing him with an opportunity of clearing himself of the charge of falsehood, the report of which was widely spread through the city. The charge," he said, "was as grossly false as it was seriously injurious to him, and he solemnly declared that he abhorred the thought of attempting to act with dissimulation in the presence of such an illustrious assembly." He farther asserted "that he never denied having *another* copy, in proof of which he said that he had, in the afternoon of the day in which he delivered his oration, in the first instance, frankly and unsolicited, intimated to the gentlemen commissioners that he *had another* copy, and, subsequently, when they made inquiries concerning it, he had told them that it was so interlined and full of erasures that no person, save himself, could read it. Moreover, he did, at the request of Heinsius, present it to him, with all its blots and imperfections, and he now solemnly averred, that when he was requested by the president to deliver the copy of his speech, he then said he had no other copy *that was fairly and legibly written*, and requested time to transcribe a neat and clean copy, which he would present to the synod; and, therefore, he must take the liberty of saying that in this matter the president had done him great injustice." Episcopius having said this, Poppius, one of his cited brethren, rose, and declared "that he and the other cited persons were ready to testify and make oath, that such was the true state of the case, as thus represented by Episcopius, adding that, as they sat next to him, they were more likely to know what he said on the occasion than any other persons." But though this declaration was made on the part of these twelve ministers, the president indirectly gave them the lie, saying that he had done Episcopius no injustice in the representation he had made concerning his conduct in this business, his answer being as he had given it; as all those persons who had any remembrance of it could testify. On this statement our professor instantly asked it as a favour, that the members of the synod who had any remembrance of his expressions would say how they understood his answer to the president. This unexpected request, the offspring of conscious innocence, occasioned great confusion in the synod. Bogerman's friends saw that he was placed in an awkward dilemma, inasmuch as it was possible that some might give a different version of Episcopius' answer to that positively asserted by the president, and, consequently, though he himself might escape suspicion of telling a falsehood, yet so gravely to charge such a crime upon another, without the most indisputable evidence, was seen to be a species of conduct highly indecorous, and ill becoming the dignity of the president of such an assembly. The irritability, however, of Bogerman's feelings at the moment prevented him from discerning this, and, therefore, in a state of furious excitement, he began to interrogate several of the members of the synod as to the answer of Episcopius; when some of his more astute friends among the lay commissioners hinted to their president that he should interpose to prevent him from proceeding. Mr. Nichols, in his remarks on the conduct of these lay gentlemen, very charitably attributes this interference to "some portion of honesty and fair dealing in them." How far this opinion may be correct, we shall not pretend to say, only we would just remind the reader that as these gentlemen lent themselves to the measures of Bogerman, to endeavour to entrap Episcopius in a falsehood, we must leave him, with this fact before him, to draw his own conclusion as to what "portion of honesty and fair dealing" governed them, in helping the ecclesiastical president out of the scrape into which the request of Episcopius had brought him.

On a review of this business, it appears to us that it was due to the character of twelve clergymen, some of whom had been in the ministry for nearly thirty years, and whose conduct had hitherto been unstained, that their testimony on this affair should have been received, had they not had the evidence of others in favour of their statement. And when the reader learns that, in consequence of this calumny on Episcopius being pertinaciously maintained, they drew up and presented, at a subsequent meeting of the synod, the following statement, requesting to be allowed to make oath to its truth, he will think that they were unjustly treated in being forced still to hear the charge frequently repeated by the president and Festus.

"We, the undesigned, pastors and ministers of the word of God, being cited by the deputies of the illustrious the States-General to this national synod, do solemnly testify in all fidelity and truth, that the oration delivered as an introduction into the synod by Dr. Simon Episcopius, our beloved brother in Christ, and professor of theology, had our most perfect approval; and we do aver that when a copy of it was demanded by the venerable president, he did expressly state to him the following words: 'I have no other copy fairly written;' and in no other way could we understand his answer. And in the farther conversation he held with the president on the subject, we believe he could not be understood to mean that he had *no other* copy, but that he had no other written out sufficiently fair to be presented to the synod. And we are fully prepared to confirm the above statement with an oath in the most solemn manner. Done at Dort, December 12, 1618. Signed, Edwardus Poppius, J. Arnoldus Corvinus, Bernardus Duinglo, Carolus Niellius, Henricus Leo, Philippus Pynacker, Assuerus Matthisius, Thomas Goswinius, Dominicus Sapma, Theophilus Ryckewaert, Benerus Vesekius, Henricus Hollingerus."

To give weight to the above, a similar testimony was drawn up and offered to be sworn to by Hollingerus and Sapma separately, on account of their being seated so near to Episcopius that one of them almost touched him during the conversation he had with the president; and, consequently, could not be mistaken in what he said

These testimonies, however, the president refused to receive.*

In closing this account, we had designed to have made some strong remarks on the conduct of the president and the other members of the synod, who supported him in the charge thus advanced against Episcopius. But, on more maturely thinking on the business, we deem it better to leave the reader to form his own judgment of their conduct. Nevertheless, we can but advert to the reasoning of Episcopius himself on the subject, in one of the subsequent sittings of the synod, when he showed that he could have no motive for saying that he had no other copy. Had the one delivered to Heinsius contained, as it was slanderously asserted, statements of a treasonable character, then, indeed, we should discover an occasion for his denying his possession of such a document. But when collated by his enemies, as it undoubtedly was, with the copy delivered to the president, and found to contain nothing dissimilar to the former, we see at once a reason why he, with such readiness, even before he was asked by the lay commissioners, adverted to the circumstance of his possessing the rough draft of the one then in possession of the officers of the synod. Consequently, this circumstance, in connection with others, will bring him before the reader's mind perfectly free from the guilt of the charge thus so dishonourably brought against him. And with every allowance for the conduct of Bogerman, as being under strong excitement, generated by a period of fierce religious strife, in which the mind may be held in that state of awful delusion that sees no defect in the most dishonourable mode of proceeding, while its subject is inflated with the idea that he is standing forth as the defender of orthodoxy against the abettors of heresy and the enemies of God's truth; nevertheless, the reader must admit his character and conduct to be those of a person who was incapable of acting in an impartial and honourable manner toward the Remonstrants.

---

* In the Dutch copies of Brandt, a plate is given representing the synod; and, from the distance which the cited are shown to have been stationed from the president, it appears extremely unjust on the part of the latter, to attempt to fix a charge of falsehood upon Episcopius, seeing it was very possible on account of this distance for him to have misunderstood his words; and it was no less unjustifiable in him in refusing to admit the testimony of the two ministers, who are represented by this plate as being so near to him as to have rendered it impossible for them to have misunderstood him; and whose office and character ought to have been a sufficient warrant for admitting their testimony. This, however, being refused, Episcopius, after having had this calumny again and again cast upon him by the president, made his last and solemn declaration concerning it in the following words: "That he had been much wronged by being charged with prevaricating; that he had said, indeed, *that he had no other copy*, but it was not all he had said, for he had subjoined *which was fairly written;* and that his words had been misunderstood, or but half heard," adding that he had no reason for lying and prevarication. After this statement, he then in the most solemn manner added: "But if any man was inclined to think otherwise, he said he could only answer that, relying upon the testimony of his conscience, and those who sat near him, whose credibility could not be questioned, he should recommend his innocency to God, and possess his soul in peace and quietness; nay, that he should be glad with all his heart that he was obliged to undergo a censure for a crime from which he knew himself to be free, and concerning which he was fully satisfied in his mind, and so should continue till God, the Searcher of hearts, should judge between him and those who thought so hardly of him." He concluded with an earnest request that this asseveration might be recorded among the acts of the synod.

CHAPTER XI.

That we might not interrupt our narrative of the proceedings of the synod, arising out of Episcopius' oration, we passed over a circumstance which took place on the 7th and 8th of December, that of the president refusing to allow the oath administered to the members of the synod, to be taken by the deputies from the province of Utrecht. This arose from a design to exclude them from this assembly, unless they ranged themselves with the cited Remonstrants. The reason assigned by the president was, that they were parties with the Remonstrants, and were instructed by their credentials to defend their doctrines. To this they answered, "that the Contra-Remonstrants were equally parties, and engaged to defend their doctrines; and, consequently, if the fact alleged against them proved them to be disqualified to act as judges on the points in debate, it equally applied to those on the opposite side." The president replied, "The cases are not parallel, because our doctrines are not to be judged by the synod, but those of the Remonstrants." This circumstance at once showed the latter what they were to expect, as to the mode in which this assembly would allow the points in dispute to be treated—a line of conduct against which the Remonstrants, as it will hereafter be seen, courageously and perseveringly protested. The Utrecht deputies, finding that they should be expelled, unless they consented to take their place beside the cited Remonstrants, consented so to do, believing that they might thus better serve their common cause, than by allowing themselves to be ejected; and, therefore, took their place beside them. This conduct on the part of the synod requires no comment.

On the 10th of December, a most stirring scene occurred. The president having required the Remonstrants to present their opinions on the five points, Episcopius rose, and asked permission to read a document he held in his hand. To this request Bogerman gave a denial, but the president of the lay commissioners consented, and it was accordingly read. It was divided into two sections; the first contained a bold disavowal of the authority of the synod, asserting that the members of it were neither lawful nor equitable judges in the matters between them and the Contra-Remonstrants, from the fact of the latter, with the exception of the foreign divines, being their avowed enemies. The allegation they advanced, they said, was grounded on the fact of their being guilty of schism, in having separated from the national Church, in consequence of the Remonstrants being members of it, declaring that they were heretical, profane, and atheistical, and, consequently, could not hold communion with them. These facts they declared they were ready to prove, and conceived that they justified them in refusing to acknowledge as equitable a tribunal constituted of such persons. The second part consisted of twelve rules, by which they said the synod, to act with justice, ought to be guided. These they supported by quotations from writers of the Calvinistic school, who had maintained the same propositions when their doctrines were to be judged by the Lutherans, under circumstances almost similar to those of the Remonstrants. But the synodists well knew that that which was wise and just when they were the parties to be judged, was quite a different matter when they in return were to be judges, and, therefore, very *discreetly* rejected as improper that which they had clamoured for as being *perfectly* righteous when devised as means of security for themselves. While this document displays the vigour of the mind which drew it up, nevertheless, it certainly dealt in no measured words of condemnation on the conduct of the synodists, whom it branded as schismatics. This was deeply galling to the president and his friends. To be thus held up as schismatics in the presence of foreign divines, a vast assembly of persons then present, and, in fact, to the Christian world, was what they neither expected nor were prepared for; and, consequently, they writhed with the bitterest anguish under a charge so deeply mortifying to them.

Bogerman's choleric feelings broke out in the strongest invectives, and he endeavoured to involve the Remonstrants with the civil authorities, and especially with Prince Maurice, who, he declared, not only appointed the synod, but sanctioned the separations which the Remonstrants had branded as being schismatical. That there might be truth in this we at this day may acknowledge, but beg leave to say, at the same time, that it proves that the whole of the proceedings against the Arminian party were those of a faction contending for pre-eminence without regard to justice; and hence the correctness of the charges advanced by them against the Dutch synodists, as being incompetent, because partial, judges on the points at issue between them and their enemies.

No one can form, says Mr. Nichols, an adequate conception of the scene which followed the reading of this document. Bogerman, the Remonstrants, the lay president, and the commissioners, were warm interlocutors during that session and the succeeding one, which was held in the afternoon of the same day. The president positively insisted that the cited were bound to acknowledge the authority of the synod and its members as lawful judges, which led Episcopius to propose the following question to the president: "If the Remonstrants sat here to decide on your doctrines, would you and the Contra-

Remonstrants acknowledge them to be equitable judges?" To which the president answered, "If it had so happened, we must have borne it, but since the government has otherwise ordered it, the cited must submit with patience." Episcopius replied, "It is one thing to submit to the decisions of a judge, and another to acknowledge the validity of his authority. We will, it is true, submit to your judgment, but we can never bring our consciences to admit that you are just judges of our doctrines, since you are our adversaries, and have seceded from us, and formed yourselves into distinct and separate Churches. To the authority of the magistracy we freely defer; nevertheless, we can but declare that it is contrary to natural justice, that it should appoint as our judges those who are our enemies."

At the afternoon session, when the Remonstrants appeared in the synod, the president pronounced a long and severe censure upon them, saying, among other things, "that it was difficult to determine whether their conduct might be considered as the result of youthful folly or studied insolence." This was followed by a command from the lay secretary that they should no longer delay the proceedings of the synod by evasions and subterfuges. Episcopius then arose, and complained of the speech of Bogerman, saying "that he had done them great injustice, by attempting to involve them with the government, in asserting that they accused the members of it with being the authors of the late schisms, whereas they had not even thought of such a thing, but, on the contrary, attributed them wholly to the clergy, with whom they certainly originated." He farther added, "that while such a proceeding on the part of the president seemed to be a favourite measure with him, he should leave the synod to judge of its equity." Having thus rebutted the charges of the president, he was proceeding to adduce facts to prove that Bogerman and many of the members of the synod were schismatics, and, consequently, incompetent judges to decide on the business before the synod, when he was clamorously interrupted, the president loudly vociferating, "By whom would you be judged? By Papists, Mennonites, or Koornhertists?"* Episcopius answered,

---

* The Mennonites here referred to were so called from Menno

"It is not our business to say who should be our judges, but to prove that many of the members of this synod are unfit to be such." This so excited the president that he called them saucy, foolish young men; when Niellius

---

Simon. According to Bentham, who gives a particular account of him in his *Schulen Staat*, he was born in Friesland in 1496, and was educated in, and subsequently ordained priest of, the Church of Rome, which he abandoned, and was rebaptized by Ubbo Philip. He subsequently became the head of the Anabaptists, and cured them of many extravagances by which they were distinguished at that time. His moral character is spoken of in very high terms by this German writer. In the *Schulen Staat* there is given a translation from the Dutch of the last and corrected edition of their confession, which was published about the time of the Synod of Dort. In turning to the third article of it, which treats of redemption by the death of Christ, to see if there were grounds for Bogerman to charge them with heresy, we found that these were very ample according to his views of heresy. We shall present the reader with the passage as we find it in Bentham. Speaking of the recovery of our first parents and their posterity from the fall, they say that Christ, das unbefleckte Lamm (oder Sohn) Gottes welcher dazu bereits von der Welt Anfang ersehen und ihnen, da sie noch im Paradis waren, zum Trost, Erlosung und Seligkeit, vor sie und alle ihre Nachkommen, verheissen und zugesagt,—das gefallene menschliche geschlecht von ihren Sunden, Schuld und Ungerechtigkeit wieder erlosen, freymachen und auffhelffen wurde. A people who dared to state that the Divine beneficence was thus to extend to the whole human family, placing each individual in a state of possible salvation through the means of a Mediator, were sure to be looked upon as heretics by Bogerman.

Bentham says, Koornhert war ein mann von grossem verstande, "was a man of powerful intellect." And, though designated here as the head of a sect, yet it does not appear that he really formed one. There might be many who adopted his religious opinions. He was, however, rendered obnoxious to the rigid Calvinists by his opposition to absolute predestination and persecution. On the latter subject he galled many of the advocates of it by his writings in defence of the rights of conscience. In addressing the ministers of Delft, who charged him with being a libertine for not joining himself to the Reformed Church, he said, "How is it to be expected that I should? Are you not for putting heretics to death here as well as at Geneva? Do you not publicly advise the same things as the false mother, that is, capital punishment for heresy; how then can I admit you to be a true Church? Give up your resolutions to put men to death, and I will be silent." He was a man of a holy and blameless life, and a great champion for the Reformation, though opposed to the bigotry and persecution of its professed friends; and for this he was held up by Bogerman in the scornful manner in which he is named in the text.

rose and said, "that it was extremely offensive to hear himself and his brethren treated so scornfully, and represented as foolish young men, when several of them had been in the ministry more than twenty years, and some of them were even older than the president. If you esteem us," said he, "youthful, frothy fellows, you should have allowed us to have stayed at home, and have sent for our seniors." Throughout the whole of this debate, it is reported by those who witnessed these proceedings, that the Remonstrants had the mastery both as to temper and argument.

On the eleventh they were again summoned into the synod, and ordered by the president to present in writing their sentiments on the five articles, with their judgment on the Confession and Catechism. Episcopius then stated that he held in his hand a short paper, which he requested permission to read, before they proceeded to comply with the order of the president. Bogerman, in a petulant tone, asked, "Is it a third oration?" Episcopius said, "It is not an oration, but merely relates to the business before the synod." Permission being granted, he read it. In this document the Remonstrants complained "that the president had not acted toward them either with sincerity or justice, by having endeavoured, in the first instance, to make Episcopius suspected of falsehood, and then to render the cited odious to their governors, by saying that they had charged them with schism, whereas they had only imputed it to the clergy. Such conduct," they declared, "while it was uncharitable, was indicative of the temper by which he was governed toward them." This paper concluded with the following protest: "Wherefore, to argue no longer about this matter, all and each of us do by this express and solemn protest declare and make known to the whole of this synod and all Christendom, that, for the before-mentioned reasons, which are contained in writing delivered by us, and fortified by arguments, we do not own or account the present synod, or the majority of it, for a lawful judge of our controversies; and that its decisions will possess no weight with us or our Churches. Having thus previously made this protestation, we will now prepare ourselves for the business before us, on account of which we believe that we have been cited. We likewise request that this writing, which contains our protest, may be inserted in the synodical acts." After the reading of this document, they were commanded to sign it, which being done, they were then asked by the president, if they were willing to obey the orders of the States deputies, which had been announced to them the preceding day. They replied they had not yet received a copy of them; having said this, they were instantly ordered to retire.

On hearing this document read, and seeing the magnanimity of the Remonstrants, under all the disadvantages which they encountered, and the studied insults which they received, Professor Barlæus, the celebrated poet, who was among the spectators of this scene, exclaims in one of his letters: "When I heard these things, I admired the courage of the men. They were really intrepid, and spoke in the synod as equals with their equals. Their countenances were unruffled and serene, and they seemed to be prepared, as they confessed, to endure all extremities."

We now come to the severest part of the contest between the Remonstrants and the synod, which finally terminated in the expulsion of the former from that assembly, in a manner we shall have to notice. After being earnestly pressed to withdraw their protest against the synodists as unequitable judges, they replied to this request in a writing containing the following statement: "That they considered the greater part of the members of the synod to be their enemies, and, therefore, they could not promise to receive its decrees with blind passive obedience; nevertheless they should bear with patience its decisions in relation to their affairs, and commend the whole matter to God, who would vindicate their innocency. If, however, they were allowed to enter into a conference with the synod on their doctrines, and suffered to defend them, and refute the contrary sentiments, so far as they might judge it necessary; and if nothing were imposed on them by the synod that would be burdensome to their consciences, in that case they would submit with entire obedience to its orders, saving always their protestation." They farther added, that "with respect to the commands of the lay commissioners, they promised to obey them in every case where their consciences would suffer them. Nevertheless, they could but declare that they valued what they deemed to be the truth of God above every consideration, and could by no means be induced to abandon it; and, therefore, humbly requested that nothing should be imposed upon them which might be oppressive to their consciences."

The request of the Remonstrants to be permitted to refute the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants, was highly offensive to the president and many of the members of the synod. And so sensitive were they on this subject, that when the cited even slightly referred to them in the way of negation, in their declaration of the first article presented to the synod on the 13th of December, the president, at the same sitting, in commanding them to prepare their statement of the four remaining articles, strictly forbade them making any attempt to refute the opinions of the Contra-Remonstrants, and especially admonished them to treat of the comfortable doctrine of election, and not of reprobation. Having presented their statement of the remaining points, they were then ordered to prepare their observations upon the Catechism and Confession. To this requirement Episcopius replied, "that they were surprised to be thus called upon for their remarks upon the Confession and Catechism before the five points were discussed; or they were allowed to defend the opinions they maintained concerning them, which they said they were authorized to do by their letters of citation." This reply caused much altercation, and the cited were again and again commanded to submit to the orders of the synod, while Heinsius, speaking on the part of the lay commissioners, attempted to give weight to their commands by striking violently on the table, a practice in which he manifested much dexterity in subsequent sittings of the synod, when conveying the commands of the lay commissioners to the Remonstrants. At length Bogerman addressed the cited, saying, "It is the judgment of the synod and the lay commissioners that you are not to be allowed the privilege of proposing and explaining your opinions to the extent that you may please, but it is to be left with the synod to judge how far this may be granted to you." To this Episcopius replied, "that they had distinctly understood, by their letters of citation, that they should have the liberty of fully explaining and defending their opinions; and that they could not prevail upon their consciences to enter upon a discussion of their differences, unless such liberty were conceded to them." This decisive declaration highly offended the synod, and several of the members inveighed against the Remonstrants as being bold and presumptuous. Polyander, who well knew the talents of his colleague, Episcopius, and had long envied the reputation they had secured to him, was glad to see the man, under whom he had formerly quailed, now attempted to be muzzled by the gripe of bigotry and ecclesiastical power; and publicly said, during this debate, that in case the Remonstrants were suffered to go on in their own way, they would render the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants, and those who maintained them, extremely odious; when the testy Gomarus added that their boldness in challenging every one to disputation, and their wish to combat every man's opinion, ought to be curbed. Amid all this the Remonstrants remained unmoved. They had prepared themselves for the day of battle, determined not to flinch, and insisted on their right to state their doctrines as they judged fit, with the liberty also of combating those of their enemies. And when the president again declared that they would not be allowed to refute the doctrines of others, Episcopius answered him in the following words: "We are resolved not to treat with the synod upon any other terms. It is for the interest of our cause to proceed in this manner. We must refute the contrary opinions. We do not so much scruple at the doctrine of election as that of reprobation;* [We feel no great difficulty in admitting that God has elected some particular persons to everlasting life,] but we can by no means admit that he has doomed by far the greater part of the human race to everlasting destruction by an irrevocable decree; and that, too, for the mere purpose of exhibiting his severity and power. This is the point that wounds us to the heart, and distresses our Churches and people, and, therefore, we must claim the privilege of refuting it."* The president said, "Take care, gentlemen, that you are not furnishing us with reasons to believe that you are aiming at nothing but evasions." "Not so," said one of the Remonstrants, "we are ready to dispute at this moment," and then in a tone of defiance, looking around upon the members of the synod, he exclaimed, "Are there none of these professors that dare dispute with us? If we are in error, pray have the kindness to show us it, and we are ready to abandon it." But the only reply made to this challenge was a command from the president that they should obey, and simply state their doctrines to the synod, he adding that the martyrs themselves did not scruple to declare their opinions to their heathen judges: "True," it was replied, "but the martyrs did not forbear refuting the opinions of their adversaries." "But," rejoined the president, "they did not oppose the opinions of others when pressed to give an account of their own." "Yes," it was said, "they did, and for so doing were put to death; and we are no less ready to suffer for the truth." During this discussion they were again and again urged to obey, it being said that it was the order of their superiors that they should only defend their doctrines so far as the synod judged proper, and not attack the opposite opinions. Niellius said, "Tertullian rightly observes that a law, to be equitably binding, should be admitted as just not only by the legislator, but also by those who are required to obey it; but this law is an intolerable one, by which it is attempted to oblige us to follow the prescriptions of our adversaries in the defence of our cause."*

---

* We insert the passage in brackets on the authority of Brandt. It is not in the Latin edition of Episcopius. We shall give the text of the Latin editor, which is a literal translation from the Dutch of Limborch. *Non adeo de Electione laboramus, sed potissimæ difficultates versantur circa reprobationis doctrinam; Deum, nempe, maximam hominum partem absoluto decreto ad æternum exitium reprobasse, idque ad suæ justitiæ supremæque potestatis gloriam; ideoque id a nobis refutandum est.*

---

* Toward the close of this debate, Gomarus, who was one of the most rigid reprobationists, and who, according to Brandt, felt himself aimed at by these remarks of Episcopius, looked askance at him, and said "that he had falsified the doctrine of reprobation, in representing it as merely designed to exhibit the severity and power of God: for no one," said he, (of course meaning himself,) "maintains that God absolutely decreed to reprobate men without respect to sin. As he decreed the end reprobation, so he decreed likewise the means as the foundation of it; that is, as God predestinated man to death, so he predestinated him to sin as the only means of death." The memorable Hales, in giving an account of this debate to the ambassador, Carlton, says that Gomarus seemed to be mightily pleased with the supposition that he had by this statement removed every thing like just ground of charge against the doctrine of reprobation; when Hales quaintly adds that he thought "he was merely playing the part of a tinker, who, in attempting to mend a kettle, makes it worse than it was before."

The president, who seized hold of every circumstance which he supposed could render the Remonstrants odious to the synod, wished to make it appear that they wanted to agitate the doctrine of reprobation, not as a matter of conscience, but by their representation of it to bring into contempt the synodists, who generally advocated it. In doing this, he adverted to the statement of one of the cited, who, when contending for the right of treating of this subject, used the word *primo;* (which is a perfect *équivoque;*) and he represented him as meaning that it should be *first* entered upon, whereas he only meant that it ought to be the *principal* point to be discussed. And perceiving that he was not so understood, he immediately explained his intention by substituting the synonyme *præcipue*. This the president well knew: still he could but act in this dishonourable way, for the purpose of misrepresenting the Remonstrants. Episcopius, perceiving this, was determined to frustrate his design, and said "that it was not for the order they contended, but the liberty of treating of reprobation as well as election." The president replied, "If this be granted, you will render the business interminable." They promised this should not be the case; nevertheless, he still refused, and required them to submit to the judgment of the synod, which claimed the right of saying how far, and in what manner, the subjects in question should be treated; and as the Remonstrants urged their right, the lay president requested Bogerman pointedly to ask them whether they would say yea or nay to this order, adding that in the event of their answering in the negative, certain gentlemen should be deputed to the Hague, to acquaint their high mightinesses with the contumacy of the Remonstrants. This was done to hold the cited *in terrorem*. Bogerman, acting upon these directions, began with Episcopius, who replied, "We must have time to consider of this matter, and give our answer in writing." This was denied them by Bogerman, but was conceded by the lay president, and they were permitted to retire for three hours. When they returned they asked leave to read their answer, but this request was not granted; and the president ordered the document to be presented to him, which was done. He first read it privately, then handed it to the assessors, who also read it, as did afterward the lay commissioners. This occupied about half an hour, during which time there was the most profound silence. At length it was read aloud, of which the following constitutes the principal part:—"If we are only allowed to answer the resolution of the synod with a subscription of yea or nay, then we say that we abide by the answer that we presented to the synod yesterday; but if permitted to explain our meaning, which we think is due to us, then we answer, we shall state and defend our sentiments, first on election, and then on reprobation; after which we shall proceed to the refutation of the opposite sentiments of the Contra-Remonstrants, and of those whom they hold to be orthodox, on each of these articles, answering any question which may be proposed by the president in the way of explanation, either in writing or *vivâ voce*, by those among us whom we may judge best qualified to do it. And that we may not be considered as asking for unreasonable time, we will leave it with the lay commissioners to limit the extent of it; nevertheless, we do hope that their justice and kindness will allow us sufficient to prepare our papers; and we promise to endeavour to make our mode of treating these subjects as grateful to the synod as possible." After reading this paper, certain parts of which had excited the bile of Bogerman, he strove with as much tact as he was master of to suppress his feelings, and with a degree of apparent *sang froid* looked a second time at its contents with assumed seriousness and concern; and then rising, said "that the first part of this document was sufficiently plain;" but proceeding to the words, "and that they would refute the sentiments of those whom the Contra-Remonstrants held as orthodox," he lost all self-government, and asked, in a tone indicative of his angry feelings being excited, "And who are meant by these?" Episcopius said, "This is not a suitable time to propose such a question, but we will name them when the business in question is before the synod." He then exclaimed, "But the Remonstrants have frequently mentioned them in their writings, and if you will not name them I will—you mean those venerable men, those brave heroes, and noble lights of the Church, whose spirits are now in heaven, and whose memory is pleasing both to God and man; I mean Perkins, Withaker, Zuinglius, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, and Piscator, with a great many others, who lived in the various countries from which deputies are now sitting in this synod." During the delivery of this speech he was so outrageously excited and carried away by anger, that his whole frame seemed to shake with the agitation of his feelings. After the storm of his passion had subsided, he saw that, as president of the synod, he had by such conduct insulted its dignity; and, therefore, he deemed it proper to order the Remonstrants to withdraw, and in their absence to make an apology, saying "that his being thus excited was occasioned by his hearing the memory of such holy men thus assailed—shamefully treated—and touched by such impure hands; and, therefore, he hoped that the lay and ecclesiastical members of the synod would forgive him."

---

* Niellius was a man of an intrepid and daring spirit, joined with unbending rectitude of principle. The former he inherited from his father, whose deeds of holy heroism he used to recite with pleasure. The father was the particular friend and fellow labourer of Junius, and amid all the dangers attendant upon a public avowal of Protestantism at that period, fearlessly preached the Gospel to the people. On one occasion, in the year 1566, he preached at the very same hour, and near the marketplace in Antwerp, where the Papist magistrates were putting to death some persons on account of their attachment to Protestantism; and this hero could see from the house where he was thus engaged the flames of the fire which were consuming his brethren in Christ.—*Brandt*, vol. i, p. 163.

By this circumstance the Remonstrants must evidently see the reluctance of the president, and through him that of the synod, to allow him to attack any of the great patrons of their system; and this reluctance would certainly not be diminished by Episcopius saying at a subsequent period, when speaking of the statements of Piscator, that several of them contained abominable doctrines, and of those who would defend them, *My soul, come not thou into their assembly.* This declaration arose out of a question of the president, in which he asked how it was that the Remonstrants, in their scheme of toleration, had proposed to tolerate the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants, though they now pronounced them to be monstrous, and highly injurious to piety. "But," said Episcopius, "you know, sir, that in the resolution of the States providing for such toleration and the peace of the Church, it was only allowed that these offensive doctrines might be debated in the universities, and not publicly taught, much less insisted upon as true, and that the belief of them is necessary to salvation." "Besides," said Niellius, "the Contra-Remonstrants themselves, at that time, made a show of rejecting them in their writings, though they have since become their patrons." This statement was not attempted to be rebutted, and its accuracy may be admitted from the fact stated in the note at page 236, of the Calvinistic brotherhood, some time before the Synod of Dort, having been warned in various provinces to be more guarded in their statements on these offensive points.

As might be expected, these declarations from the Remonstrants were displeasing to the foreign divines. For though they had not gone the lengths of the Dutch Calvinists, nevertheless, this mode of reference to the names of these persons, by the president, was calculated to prejudice them against the cited ministers. Of this Bogerman was aware, and, taking advantage of this feeling, he dismissed the cited, and then proceeded to ask these foreigners their opinion of them. It was generally what he wished. Many were very severe against them, especially those of Geneva, who did not scruple to intimate that strong measures, in the way of chastisement, ought to be adopted against them by the civil authorities. This can be no matter of surprise. They had been familiarized with persecution in the person of the founder of their school, and as his conduct as a persecutor had brought no reproach upon his name, up to the period of which we are writing, among the reformed doctors who had espoused his theological opinions, and adopted his system of Church government, these divines could feel no misgivings in avowing such sentiments.*

---

* Let it not be supposed we intend to intimate that it necessarily

It was now that certain members of the synod were sent to the Hague, to inform the States-General of its proceedings. The Remonstrants also transmitted a document to that assembly, vindicatory of their conduct, but no attention was paid to it, and the deputies returned with a declaration from their high mightinesses of their approval of the measures of the synod; with positive commands to the cited to answer any questions proposed to them by the president, with a simple yea or nay, *vivâ voce*, or in writing, as the synod should deem most proper. Thus armed, Bogerman summoned these ministers, and asked them, "whether they acknowledged as theirs the five articles defended at the conference of the Hague?" Episcopius being about to reply on behalf of his brethren, the president of the lay commissioners, judging, it seems, by his manly bearing, that he was unawed by the reading of the injunction of the States, and wishing to give weight to it, in order to secure his submission, stopped him, and commanded him to speak slowly, that his answer might

---

follows that, because a man in this day may go all the lengths of Calvin's creed, he must, therefore, imbibe any portion of Calvin's persecuting spirit. We rejoice to know the contrary to be the case. Better times and better views have come upon us than those in which he lived; and we are glad to mark the more tolerant feeling manifested by those who, nevertheless, revere his memory; as will be seen from the spirit of a writer who states, in the Christian Observer for June, 1834, that, while residing in Geneva, he felt much pained at not being able to find the grave of Calvin; nevertheless, he was glad to know that the place of Servetus' execution would shortly be unknown, the cause of which will be found in the following statement. His remarks upon the subject are worthy of the liberality of the present age.

"I am glad to find that no one will be able to point out the exact spot where Servetus was burned. I lately took a walk to the *Champ du Bourreau*, the ancient place of execution, and where Servetus closed his melancholy career. A few years ago the ground was all waste, and a large cavity existed, which was the place of death; but recently it was sold by government, and the purchaser has completely filled up the hollow, changed the whole appearance of the neighbourhood, and converted the Golgotha of Geneva to a smiling field. I trust this event is emblematical of the better views and feelings which are gaining possession of Christendom in regard to religious liberty. May the time soon arrive when universally the truth of Christ will be left to fight its contest and gain its victory by its own heaven-born strength, unaided or rather unembarrassed by the *weapons of carnal warfare*."

be written down. The professor then recommenced with great calmness and dignity; and in a tone of voice indicative of an unsubdued spirit, he delivered his answer in the following words:—"Having weighed this matter in the fear of the Lord, and sought direction from him in earnest prayer, I cannot so far do violence to my conscience as to treat the matter in debate otherwise than as stated in the last paper we presented to the synod." With this statement all the others concurred. The president, however, attempted to force them to answer yea or nay, when Episcopius said they would if they were allowed to give their explanations with their answers. But the synod, now elated with the authority with which it was invested by the States, treated this proposal with such disrespect and contempt as actually to burst into fits of laughter. This conduct the Remonstrants did not fail to upbraid them with, as unmanly and ungentlemanly, and in the circumstances in which their intrigues had placed them, as mean and cowardly, being far from that dignity of feeling which treats a subdued foe with a species of generous lenity and courtesy.

On the 11th of January a farther attempt was made to induce them to answer yea or nay to the proposed questions. "We will answer you six hundred or a thousand questions," said Episcopius, "if you will allow us at the same time to discuss the doctrines of election and reprobation." "You shall do it," said the president, "if you can produce any of the doctors of the Netherlands, who have presented them in the way that you say, that is, in an unscriptural manner, and injurious to the glory of God." Bogerman supposed that by thus stating the subject he had placed the Remonstrants in a dilemma, but, instead of that, Episcopius readily accepted the challenge; when the other found that he had gone too far, and instantly withdrew his proposal.* Subsequently several of the members of the synod thought that the questions the president intended to propose should be given to the cited, and they should be allowed to return their answers in writing, in their own way. This Bogerman and his Dutch brethren opposed, alleging that in that case they would occupy too much of the time of the synod; when it was replied by Episcopius, "Not so; and in proof of this let the questions be given to us, and we will answer them: and to show that we do not contend for order, we will incorporate our answers with our declaration, or at least append them to it. This we promise to do on an early day, our observations on the first article being ready." Hoping that matters were nearly arranged, Episcopius made signs with his hand as significant of his waiting the approval of the president. Several of the better part of the synod actually rose up and beckoned to Bogerman to comply, and deliver to the professor the questions which had been prepared by the officers of the synod. This, however, looked too much like coming to terms of amity with the Remonstrants; and, therefore, he refused to comply with this reasonable request, and by the adoption of tortuous proceedings, which it is not necessary for us to detail, he finally carried his point in getting the synod to consent to judge them from their writings; and having accomplished this object, they were required to present to this assembly

---

* That the reader may judge whether Episcopius had sufficient cause for accepting the challenge, and Bogerman in refusing it, he ought to turn to the *Acta Remonstrantium*, and examine the passages there introduced by the Remonstrants, which they quote from the works of the Dutch and other Calvinistic divines, giving the volume and page from which they make their selections, and which they presented to the synod. He may take, however the following as a specimen, selected from a vast mass of a similar kind

Non est falsum, &c., Deum absolutâ suâ voluntate, cui nemo resistere possit, longe maximam humani generis partem reprobare et ad æternum exitium creare.—*Antonius Thysius ad summam Baronis*, pp. 10, 20.

Reprobationem tria consequuntur, privatio gratiæ, peccata, pœnæ peccatorum.—*Gom. disp. de præd.*

Fructus reprobationis sunt desertio, privatio gratiæ Dei et mediorum, induratio, &c.—*Fest. Thes. Catech*, p. 216.

In absolutè reprobatis decrevit Deus non efficere fidem, vel non annunciando illis Evangelium, vel ad hoc tantum annunciando, ut reddantur inexcusabiles.—*Piscator ad duplic. Vorstii*, part i, pp. 25, 265, 274, 400.

Fideles sæpenumero et horibiliter se peccatis contra Deum et legem ipsius polluunt, quinimo in idolatriam, superstitionem, falsam doctrinam, hæresin, altercationes, Christi abnegationem, securitatem, diffidentiam, licentiam vivendi, superbiam, rebellionem, homicidium, adulterium, proditionem, aliaque similia prolabuntur, etc.

Nihilominus tamen credimus et hisce non obstantibus persuasum habemus nos nec totaliter nec finaliter excidere, nec excidere posse ex paterno amore et gratiâ Dei erga nos.—*Smoutius in suo scripturali vai, &c.*, p. 77.

their remarks on the first article, which they had intimated was in a state of preparation for delivery. Episcopius' answer to this request furnished a second occasion to Bogerman to charge him with telling another lie. It was to this effect: "The writing is not yet ready, but it shall be ready in a few days." To which Bogerman replied, "But you said it was ready, and had it in your hand." The professor said "that his words had been incorrectly understood. The writing alluded to in his hand certainly contained the substance of their observations, but it was necessary that a fair copy should be made from it, in order to be presented to the synod." This explanation, however, the president chose not to consider satisfactory, as will be seen from the mode in which he referred to this circumstance when they were finally dismissed from the synod, which took place shortly after.

On the fourteenth of January, after being summoned into the presence of this assembly, a long speech was made to them by the president, on the subject of the liberty they requested, and the resolution of the synod not to grant that request, he stating, at the same time, that they were bound to obey their governors; and then asked them, if they would plainly and without any condition obey the orders of the lay commissioners? To this question Episcopius, answering for all the cited persons, said "he held in his hand a document containing an answer to the president's question, and entreated that it might be read." Bogerman refused, and insisted that they should peremptorily answer yea or nay. Episcopius said, "Such an answer is to be found in this document." A long debate between him and the president then followed. At length the professor said, "It seems very strange that in a free synod there cannot be granted to us so small a favour as to have our answer to a question read." This occasioned the paper being received and read. It contained a farther declaration of their sentiments on the first article, to which was prefixed a statement of their reasons for not complying with the order of the synod, and their determination to abide by their former answer. The president then asked each of the cited whether he abided by this reply, when all having answered, Yes, he desired that they should individually sign this document. They said they had done it already. But not satisfied, and as though determined to show his authority, and mortify them, he required that they should come to his table and sign it again. Episcopius as professor of theology in the principal seat of learning belonging to the States, felt that he was insulted by this requirement from an individual who was his inferior in rank, and rising from his seat said, as he approached the table of Bogerman, *What slavery is this!* and having signed it, he retired with a countenance expressive of his estimate of the man who could thus treat him with contempt, because by the power of a faction he had been invested with a little brief authority. Bogerman having in this manner gratified his feelings in trampling on the giant of the party, allowed the paper to be handed to the others, who signed it at their own table. This being done, it appears he was determined to repay what he considered the haughty demeanour of the Remonstrants, as shown in the conduct of the professor, Episcopius; and in the form of a dismissal, thus denounced them. "The synod up to this very period has treated you with all gentleness, kindness, forbearance, patience, and tenderness; openly, sincerely, and honestly; but you in return have only treated it with deception, artifice, frauds, and lies. And from your conduct in relation to the writing you last presented to the synod, it appears you intended to end as you began; *for with a lie you began, and with a lie you ended.* Episcopius in the first instance denied having another copy of his speech, and in the second, he declared that your last writing was ready for delivery, and then subsequently denied it. God, who is the protector and defender of his Church, and the searcher of hearts, sees and knows the tricks and the subtleties with which you have endeavoured to deceive this venerable synod; he knows, also, the sincere desire and inclination of the synod to effect your good, of which he will take account, and also punish your conduct, which has been marked by falsehood, wickedness, fraud, deceit, and contempt. And, therefore, that the synod may proceed peaceably to execute the will and intention of their high mightinesses, the States, in searching and examining your doctrines, which, hitherto, in consequence of your presence, it has not been able to accomplish, it is therefore resolved that you be dismissed from the synod, and that, too, in the manner which you have merited, namely, as being false and deceitful. And the synod deems it right that you should be informed that, because your obstinacy and disobedience have been so great and manifold, it is designed to publish your conduct to the whole Christian world; and that it be stated to you, that it is not without those spiritual arms by which it can punish you for your contumacy, obstinacy, and disobedience; or the means to vindicate the sentence thus passed upon you." He then added in a most scornful and commanding manner, "*Dimittimini, exite*, Depart, begone."

The Remonstrants having received this contemptuous dismissal with the utmost composure, Episcopius rose with manly dignity to speak on behalf of himself and his brethren, and said, "In imitation of our blessed Saviour, we shall pass over these reproaches in silence, and let God judge between us and the synod, as to the insincerity, fraud, wickedness, and falsehood with which we are charged;" when he was interrupted by the president, with his usual exclamation of *satis, satis*, when he wanted to hinder them from speaking. The Remonstrants then rose together to leave the synod. Niellius exclaimed, in passing through the crowd that witnessed their dismissal, "I appeal from the injustice of the synod to the just judgment seat of Jesus Christ." Næranus added, "that he appealed to the throne of God, where those who sat in the synod as judges should finally appear to be judged themselves." Hollingerus said to those who passed before him, "Depart, depart from the assembly of the wicked."

This unceremonious and violent expulsion of the Remonstrants was highly displeasing to many of the foreign divines. They felt that all the decencies of good behaviour had been outraged, and their dignity as gentlemen and members of the synod implicated in the conduct of the president, in thus acting toward those who were their equals in character, scholarship, talents, respectability, and office, as though they had been criminals brought from the lowest grades and dregs of society. Our countryman, Hales, bitterly complained of Bogerman's behaviour, and many of the foreigners, equally indignant, expressed their disapprobation of it at a subsequent sitting of the synod, as being passionate and insulting. Even Balcanqual, with all the rigid attachments of a Scotchman of that day to Calvin's views of *election* and *reprobation*, when writing to Sir Dudley Carlton, says, "It was a strange proceeding, and a scandalous offence; I must confess that I am extremely troubled as oft as I think upon it, for if the Remonstrants say that the president pronounced a sentence which was not that of the synod, they certainly would not speak an untruth. Much has been said by the lawyers of France against the neglect of forms at the Council of Trent, but with much more of justice may such a complaint be made in relation to this affair, for not a third of the members were asked to vote; hence the sentence was not that of the synod, while the bitter and insulting words which it contained were uttered by the sole authority of this one man."

At first the inland divines seemed to have some apprehension that this rough dismissal might be offensive to that sense of honour and propriety which is supposed to be associated with the dignity of office and station; and, therefore, sent a deputation to the Hague to represent this conduct of the president in the best light to Maurice, and the States, which were now at his bidding. They, however, soon found that all their misgivings were altogether needless, for the prince was prepared to go greater lengths than these in relation to the Arminian party; and, therefore, they returned with his perfect approval of this affair, and that of his creatures in the States. This seems to have given the quietus to all the fears of the Dutch divines, and suppressed any returns of remorse that might be felt on the part of the foreigners, on account of the treatment shown to the Remonstrants.

Two circumstances demand a moment's consideration in relation to this famous synod. The first is that of the conduct of the Remonstrants, in protesting against it as being an illegal and partial tribunal, and, therefore, unfit to decide upon the controversies which had agitated the Dutch republic for so many years; and, secondly, the refusal of the synod to allow these ministers to state their doctrines in that way which they judged to be the most likely to make them appear as being in conformity with the sacred Scriptures and the doctrine of the Reformed

Church. As regards the former circumstance, many have blamed the cited, and charged them with obstinacy and want of deference to such an assembly. But the parties who do this, must either not have made themselves acquainted with the state of feeling that had long existed among the Calvinist clergy against their brother pastors who had embraced the milder views of Melancthon and Arminius,—with the system of vexation and persecution which they had everywhere adopted, for the purpose of excluding them from the ministry; or else they must be so warped by the influence of name and creed as to be totally incapable of judging impartially in the matter. Besides, had not the Contra-Remonstrants so acted, the cited had precedent for such a line of conduct furnished by Protestants, yea, and even by those who were designated Reformed. Take, for instance, the case of the Protestants in relation to the Council of Trent, who refused to acknowledge the legality of that assembly, and consequently to submit to its decisions, on the ground of its being partial. And what forms a more direct parallel to the case of the Remonstrants, was the conduct of Beza and other ministers of the Reformed Church, who refused even to enter into a *conference* (which was all the Remonstrants desired of the synod) with the Papists at Poissi, till an assurance was given them by the king of France, that the clergy and prelates should not be their judges. This was done by Beza and his friends, because they declared that the prelates and clergy were opposite parties, and consequently unfit to judge on the points in dispute between them. They, therefore, demanded that commissioners should be appointed as judges, who were supposed not to be pledged to an unalterable maintenance of certain dogmas to which the others were attached from their very profession.*

---

* A lengthened account of this conference is to be found in Clark's *Marrow of Ecclesiastical History*, in his Life of Beza. This Protestant divine took a prominent part in this conference. It was appointed during the distracted state of France in the sixteenth century, for the purpose of settling the religious differences between the Papists and Protestants, and laying the basis of a toleration for the Churches of the latter throughout the extensive dominions at that time under the rule of the different branches of the powerful

Of the validity of the objection alleged by the Remonstrants to the Dutch Calvinist ministers as being unsuitable judges, on the ground of the feeling and conduct they had evinced toward them, we could give full and painful specimens; but we may just mention the conduct of the leading members. As to Bogerman, so well was he known as an opponent of the cited and their doctrines, that six years before the synod was convened, one of the principal writers of the Remonstrants had actually drawn up an anticipated and probable account of the proceedings of the intended synod, so as to be almost an exact counterpart of its cruel and unjust measures toward the Arminians, of which he makes Bogerman to be the prime agent. "Little," says Brandt, "did Barlæus suppose what a resemblance his description would have to the events that actually afterward took place." As to Festus, we have already shown sufficient of him to prove that he could be no impartial judge. With respect to Faukelius, one of the assessors, he had consented to a separation from the Remonstrants, and joined his provincial synod in previously condemning their doctrines as being contrary to the word of God. Plancius also, who is mentioned at page 118, as unwilling to dine at the same table with Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius, was a bitter enemy of the Remonstrants, while Rolandus, his colleague,* had long before declared that if Melancthon was alive, he would

house of Bourbon. It was a very august and imposing assembly—some of the first personages of the state being present—namely: Charles IX., king of France, the queen mother, the king of Navarre, the cardinal de Tournon, with many of the prelates and nobles of the kingdom. Beza was principal speaker, and, in conjunction with his brethren, represented 2190 Protestant Churches. This conference ended without producing any thing like amity between the opposite parties, and prepared the way for consequences of which the subsequent history of France gives painful details.—*Clark and Nichols.*

* If a writer of the present day can ask, "Is there among us a doctrine which, beyond any other, is *anti-social* and *uncharitable?* and then answer, If hyper-Calvinism be not that doctrine, we are chargeable with calumny;"† with how much more of justice could the implied charge be applied to the hyper-Calvinism of Plancius and those ministers who sat as the judges of the Arminians in the Synod of Dort?

† *Saturday Evening*, p. 293.

be the first to condemn him in any synod where he should attempt to teach his doctrine. Damman, as Heinsius, was an apostate from Arminianism, and, of course, like him, when joined to the other party, who were in favour with the powers that be, became a bitter and unrelenting enemy of his former friends. All this the Remonstrants knew, nay more, they felt it, and how they could conscientiously allow such an assembly to be equitable judges, whose leading officers had thus acted and cherished the feelings which they did toward them, and say to them, and the parties who had voted them into their high situations, "Gentlemen, you are very suitable judges of our opinions;"—is an act which though the reader may see possible, yet the writer really cannot.

As to the second case, that of the Contra-Remonstrants not allowing the Arminian clergy to state their doctrines, or argue with them on the points in dispute, it does not much surprise us; for who has sufficient saintship to allow that another has more truth on his side than himself; while "to assail our convictions is not merely to wound our self-love, and to irritate our pride, but it is to withdraw something from the interior warmth and vigour of the soul;" and, therefore, he who would call in question the canonicity of our creed makes an attempt upon our assurance of possessing truth, and the peace consequent upon that assurance. Such a person places us on the defensive, and we instinctively meet him as an antagonist; while to prevent even his incipient efforts thus to rob us of our chiefest good seems perfectly natural. If this state of feeling is the attendant of man in his individual capacity, it gathers strength and force by association; for when certain dogmas are made the bond of union among bodies of men, any attack upon the common creed not only excites the feelings of jealousy, of individual interest, but also of that which grows out of our incorporate relation and obligation to others.

And while such excitements must have been felt by the Dutch divines, they likewise knew that it was possible for the Remonstrants to present their doctrines, and especially that of reprobation, in such a point of light as to shake the confidence of the people in other parts of the system, some of whom might have acted like the memorable Hales, who said, when he heard Episcopius expound and press the 16th verse of the third chapter of St. John against the doctrine of the Contra-Remonstrants, "he from that time bid John Calvin good night."

Besides, to have allowed the cited ministers to argue with the synod on the points in dispute, would have been to admit them to a species of equality with the synodists, which, though perfectly just where disputants meet to settle a question by the mere force of argument, yet, as the Dutch Calvinists had succeeded in the measures they had adopted to gain power and ascendency, it was not to be expected, from the present state of human nature, that they would give up their vantage ground, and meet the Remonstrants on such terms. Moreover, there were individuals who took a leading part in the affairs of the synod who carried into it a degree of hostility against Episcopius from the remembrance of the past. Is it to be supposed that Sibrandus, who had debated with him while he was yet a beardless boy, "but in whom all the elements were so mixed, that Nature might stand up and say, 'This is a man;'" and who on that occasion was so struck with his powers as publicly to assert "that Arminius was a mere child to him;"—and when subsequently foiled by him, and witnessing the admiration that the victories of this tyro had secured to him, could, under the chagrin he suffered in consequence, adopt the infamous measures mentioned at page 147 to ruin his successful rival: we repeat it, is it to be supposed that he would now be willing to see himself, and very many by whom he was surrounded, thrown into the shade by the talents and extensive learning of an opponent whose native genius, accurate judgment, and commanding powers of eloquence, had been more fully matured by intense study, deep research, and constant application to the duties of the office he sustained as professor of theology in one of the first seats of learning in Europe? Neither can it be matter of surprise that Polyander, another leading member of the synod, who had felt so far mortified at the homage paid to the superior talents of his colleague, even by Heinsius, as not to be able to restrain himself within the bounds of courtesy when witnessing the marked preference shown to tho conversational powers of Episcopius, in a select party of some of the first scholars of which Leyden could boast; so that under feelings of mortification he exclaimed, *Gentlemen, I can bear nothing so ill as contempt*, that is, I cannot bear to see this decided preference given to my colleague: we say it cannot be matter of surprise that this man, also, should be found among those who opposed Episcopius being permitted to combat the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants.

The foreign divines, however, who had suffered none of these previous mortifications, and had been powerfully struck with the professor's commanding eloquence, manifested in the speech which he had delivered shortly after his entrance into the synod, were anxious to hear and see the *man* in all his strength; while many of the auditors, who had actually been drawn from various parts of the provinces to Dort, for the purpose of witnessing the proceedings of this assembly, were deeply mortified at the circumstance of the Remonstrants being prevented from stating and defending their doctrines; and on that account retired murmuring, and saying that they had been disappointed in the object for which they had taken so long a journey, and, therefore, were determined to hasten home.

CHAPTER XII.

The Remonstrants being thus excluded from the synod, that assembly resolved upon examining their writings in order to pronounce a judgment upon their doctrines. During several sittings the varied points held by them were brought under discussion, and now that there was no antagonist to combat with, Polyander, and afterward Sibrandus, who had been formerly foiled by Episcopius, were the first to address that assembly, and in his absence manfully triumphed, and bore away many a palm of victory from him and those who advocated the doctrines of Arminius. And what must have heightened the value of these trophies was the fact of their being gained in the presence of a large auditory, many of whom were ladies, who were admitted to witness the intellectual superiority of these professors, and other native and foreign divines who took a leading part in these debates. Sibrandus, who some time before had sought to gain a reputation by becoming, unsolicited, the antagonist of Grotius, but who sunk, in his intended attacks, unnoticed under his native littleness, certainly had now a better opportunity of succeeding in the attainment of distinction and eminence; but he and Gomarus, according to Hales, had alternate fits of violent passion, and thereby lost all the credit they might otherwise have obtained in beating an absent enemy.* One does not like to say too much of the dastardly conduct of these Dutch divines, but their manifestation of courage under such circumstances can but remind one of the equal prowess and vaunting of our Falstaff. To the disgraceful situation in which they were placing themselves in the estimation of every dignified and independent mind, these Belgic theologians appeared to be totally insensible, as well as reckless of the means they made use of to accomplish their object, which, according to Balcanqual, seemed to originate with their bitter enmity to, and eager desire to crush the Remonstrants. The foreign divines, however, who were not governed by the same feelings, and as members of the synod were of course accountable to a certain extent for its proceedings, felt that they were degraded by the adoption of such measures, and several of them could not forbear stating their sentiments on the subject to the lay commissioners; saying "that it was a strange mode of proceeding, thus to confute the doctrines of the cited in their absence, though they were yet in the town, and had declared, and still declared their readiness to state them. This appeal to these personages was not without its effect, they at once seeing that such a mode of acting was disreputable, and though they could not so far revoke what had been done by the synod as to allow the Remonstrants again to appear in it without involving it in disgrace, nevertheless they determined, though it is generally believed very much in opposition to the leading Dutch divines, to send for the cited, and grant them the liberty of drawing up in writing a statement, by way of explanation and vindication of the five points which they maintained, allowing them fourteen days for the execution of this work. They thanked their lordships, but complained of the shortness of the time proposed, and pleaded for more, which was denied them. They therefore engaged to do what they could by diligent application, to meet their wishes.

---

* Balcanqual says, "Sibrandus and Gomarus keep their fits of madness by course; the last fit before this came to Gomarus' turn, and this day Sibrandus flew out, but with such raving and fierceness of countenance that he was checked in his words by the lay and ecclesiastical presidents." Now though Gomarus thus stands associated with Sibrandus in this very uninteresting manner, yet he was infinitely the superior man in point of mind, and, with all his crabbedness, far better hearted than most of the Dutch Calvinist divines. Though the enemy of the doctrines of Arminius, and, of course, those who espoused them, yet, when he saw the cited condemned, some kindly feeling was excited in his heart toward them, and he made a proposal that a portion of their stipend should be allowed them, which was rejected by the stern Bogerman, while Polyander, the colleague of Episcopius, could see him degraded without showing any regret, or uttering a word of sympathy. One thing is to be said in favour of Gomarus,—that, so far as we know, he never advocated the doctrine of shedding blood on account of supposed error, which certainly cannot be said of many other of the Belgic Calvinistic clergy.

During the fourteen days thus allowed to these ministers to draw up their writings, they scarcely ever appeared in public. Every moment was occupied, and the Contra-Remonstrants, who were full of surmises, threw out intimations that some of them had left the town. They closely watched all persons who visited them, and were deeply mortified at witnessing some slight signs of sympathy being manifested for them. The mystery, however, that seemed to hang over their proceedings, was, to a great extent, expelled, when, on the 7th of February, they presented a writing to the lay commissioners of no less than two hundred and four sheets, which comprehended their remarks on the first article! Its enormous size deeply mortified even the commissioners; but when it was carried into the synod the Dutch divines, who had thought of merely examining some few of their works, and especially what they had stated at the Hague conference, and intended to draw from thence matter on which to pronounce the condemnation of their sentiments, were actually thrown into ecstasies of rage, and some of them let out their spleen so far as to declare "that the Remonstrants were adepts in the black art, and must have dealt with the devil, otherwise they never could have written so much in so short a time! These gentlemen, who thus gave the cited ministers the honour of having had the same companionship and help with which Doctor Faustus was favoured, certainly had some cause for mortification, at the idea of having to wade through two hundred and four sheets of closely written manuscript, containing bold accusations against themselves, and an exhibition of many of the horrid statements they had made on the subject of reprobation; with a refutation of that and other doctrines maintained by them, and those whom they were accustomed to venerate as mighty chieftains and defenders of hyper-Calvinism; and, therefore, *prudently* determined that it should be only glanced at by the president and others who should report upon its contents. "We desired," says Balcanqual, "some part of it to be read; I must needs say the cited had no favour, for I will assure your lordship that the president picked out the worst part of it; there were some five leaves read,* which contained nothing but a bitter satire against Calvin, Beza, Paræus, Piscator, Whitaker, Perkins, Bogerman, Festus, and twenty more; but, in truth, though unhappily, yet finely penned; methought it was Episcopius' tongue." In this he was correct, for Limborch says he wrote by far the greater part of it; other portions being composed by Borrhius and Niellius.

This writing, though received by the synod as declarative of the sentiments of the cited on the first article, comprehending the two doctrines of election and reprobation, was not appealed to as a standard by which its judgment was to be formed of the opinions of the Remonstrants on these two points. For while it was being prepared, the synod was actually engaged in forming a judgment on them, and before it had been examined it closed its inquiries on these doctrines. This was done after Altingius had made the following statement concerning reprobation, which he said was the doctrine of the Reformed Churches: "That God had reprobated whom he pleased according to his mere will, without any regard to sin; that the sins which followed such reprobation were the fruits of it; nevertheless, God is not the author of them; and that though the hardening and blinding of men's hearts and eyes proceeded from God, nevertheless we ought to cry with the cherubim, Holy is God, though he reprobates! Holy is God, though he blinds! Holy is God, though he hardens!" After these remarks had been made, the synod, says Brandt, judged that enough had been said on the first article of the controversy; and we think so too.

---

* It appears, however, from Balcanqual's statement, that different parts of this document were skimmed over at other times in the synod.

From the above statement it will be seen that the synod did not intend to pay much attention to the written defence of the Remonstrants on the five articles, as the Dutch divines had made up their minds to condemn them without appealing to it, a fact one of them unguardedly let out in a conversation with Poppius. Independently of this information, however, the Remonstrants knew this to be the design of the Contra-Remonstrants; and, therefore, did not write for them, but for the Christian world at large; and despite of all the half menaces of the lay commissioners, to induce them to abbreviate their statements, they were determined to give a full defence of their views on these points, or else none at all. And when Episcopius and one or two others of the cited were sent for by the lay commissioners, who said to them that if they could finish their remarks on the remaining article in ten days, they promised to receive them, and endeavour to get them read in the synod, though they apprehended that it would not stay for them, but proceed as before. "Let them do as they please," said Episcopius, "we would not prepare our writings for the sake of the synod, but only in obedience to your lordships: they have insultingly ejected us from the synod, declaring us to be impostors and liars; and though it were true, we may say, without boasting, we should not be more guilty than the best of them." They were then urged to finish their writings in the ten days. Episcopius replied, "It is impossible; we must meet the subterfuges and sophistry of Mr. Aimes, the English divine." The president of the lay commissioners said, "You need say but little on the fifth article. Why urge the possibility of falling from faith? for in so doing, you are taking sides with the devil, who claims such a fall as purely belonging to himself. We ought to labour in defence of ourselves rather than of the devil." It was replied "that their doctrine did by no means tend to promote the devil's kingdom, but rather to destroy it, by warning men of their danger, and inspiring them with holy concern and care to avoid his snares, and stand upon their guard; while the opposite doctrine produced fatal security and confidence, and many were thereby easily led into his toils. As to the mode of defending their opinions on the remaining points, they had conceived a plan, but as yet had inserted nothing upon paper. Nevertheless, they would do their utmost to prepare their remarks on them in three weeks, and, if possible, in a fortnight. Being ordered to withdraw, they were instantly informed, by one of their brother ministers, that Fredericus and Niellius had been deposed from their ministry by the Contra-Remonstrants, and their families ordered to quit their dwellings at a short notice. Episcopius, when again ordered into the presence of the lay commissioners, addressed them, saying, "What strange proceedings are these! We are come hither at the command of your lordships, and while yet employed in defending our cause, two of our brethren are thus ill treated." One of the commissioners had sufficient sense of propriety to say, "It is unjustifiable;" when Niellius came forward and declared "he would leave the town, for being now deprived of his ministry, he had nothing more to do there." But he was forbidden to depart, a promise being made him to bring his case before their high mightinesses, which, however, was never fulfilled. The Remonstrants then proceeded to prepare the remainder of their writings, the synod in the mean time anticipating them by passing its judgment upon the five articles, and preparing its canons for publication.

On the 18th of March, Episcopius and three others presented the defence of their sentiments on the third, fourth, and fifth articles. This document amounted to one hundred and thirty-three sheets of manuscript. Its size absolutely frightened the commissioners, and they actually began to storm at the Remonstrants, charging them with hindering the business of the synod. Episcopius replied, "How can that be, since the synod has gone on with its affairs, and passed their judgment upon our doctrines, without waiting for our statement of them? Gentlemen," said he, "understand, these last papers have not been prepared for the synod, who have long since refused to hear us in our defence." "But have you not produced these writings that the synod may judge of them." "No," replied Episcopius. "Take that down," said one of them to the secretary. "Why, then, did you write them?" it was asked. "That your lordships may take cognizance of them." "But if you did not write them for the use of the synod, why produce them at all?" "Niellius answered, "We did it in order that the commissioners might judge of their contents, for they who are to execute a sentence ought to be acquainted with the matters on which their judgment is to be founded." "We understand the meaning of these bold expressions," it was replied; "you mean to say that we ought not to put a sentence in execution without hearing the cause. Do you pretend to instruct us in the law?" Niellius answered, "I speak as a divine, not as a lawyer." It was again asked, "But if they are not designed for the synod, of what use are they?" Episcopius answered, "Though we do not offer them to the synod, we present them to your lordships, if you choose to accept of them." "Let the secretary take a note of that," it was instantly said; when Episcopius coolly remarked, "It is unnecessary that he should give himself that trouble, inasmuch as we have inserted the same in our papers in the following words: "*These documents have not been prepared for the use of the synod, seeing that we disavow all farther connection with it.*"

After the delivery of these writings to the lay commissioners, they were presented to Bogerman the same day, who showed them to Balcanqual; and, when the latter declared it to be utterly impossible for the synod to examine them, the other humorously replied, "Don't be alarmed; that is rendered unnecessary by the statement of the cited themselves," showing him at the same time the passage adverted to above, in which the Remonstrants declare *that they relinquish all farther connection with the synod*, and thus both parties were prepared for separation, the one to condemn, the other waiting to be condemned. Prior to this, however, being done by the ecclesiastical, and subsequently by the lay president, the synod went on with its work, one of the members declaring, as it proceeded in its task of condemning the doctrines of the Remonstrants, that "the longer it sat, the more holy it became." Perhaps some persons of this day will think otherwise.

We cannot notice more of the circumstantial account of the proceedings of the synod, as given by Limborch up to the time of sentence of deprivation of office being past upon the cited, than to say that the English divines, and even Balcanqual himself, took a very active part in paring down some of the statements designed to be inserted in the canons, which were horribly offensive even to their Calvinistic ears. And Balcanqual had the honesty to say, when writing to Sir Dudley Carlton, that there was very great danger of the canons assuming such a character as would render them the scoff of all the sound-headed and moderate of Christendom.* They were designed to have been drawn up by a packed committee of Bogerman's friends with all the colouring of the Dutch Calvinism of that day, and to have been carried through the synod in a smuggled way, and then palmed on the Reformed Churches as the opinions of that assembly. The English divines and other foreigners felt themselves insulted by this attempted act of trickery, and positively rejected these intended measures to the great mortification of the hyper-Calvinists of the assembly.

That the reader may see the correctness of our statement as to the revolting sentiments that were wished to be foisted into these canons, we shall name two which were so strenuously opposed by the English divines.† These passages, it should be understood, still continued in the canons after they had been much pruned and pared down, in consequence of the opposition made to them by our countrymen in the synod.

---

* His words are, "If your lordship's care do not now most of all show itself for procuring of good counsel to be sent hither for the constitution of the canons, we are like to make the synod a thing to be laughed at in after ages."—*Hale's Remains*, p. 520.

† It may here be stated, to the honour of the English divines, that, when certain dogmas were condemned in these canons, they said that such condemnation could not be applied to the opinions of the Remonstrants, seeing that they were not to be found in their writings. One can but be pleased with this integrity, so directly opposite to the practice of Festus Hommius and others, who were perpetually originating terrible doctrines and statements, and then attributing them to the cited and other Remonstrants, for the purpose of bringing upon them infamy and reproach.

On the 20th of April, they being still dissatisfied, objected to the following assertions: First, *that God moves the tongues of men to blaspheme him*; and, secondly, *that man can do no more good nor less evil than he actually does.* The divines of Hesse selected others of an offensive character, which they said ought to be rejected. The president, finding that the opposition created by the English divines at this session against many of the harsh expressions inserted in the canons was so great, deemed it prudent to break up the assembly, and required those who objected to them to reflect upon them in the interim. Bogerman's real design, however, by this proceeding, was, to consult with the more rigid Calvinists of the synod, especially with the Dutch divines, and also to feel the pulse of the lay commissioners as to their willingness to sanction the expressions which were offensive to the English clergymen and more moderate Calvinists of this assembly. The lay commissioners, who were now goaded by Maurice and the States-General to urge on the affairs of the synod, in consequence of the enormous cost attendant upon its lengthened sittings; and, fearing that if they allowed the objections of the English to be entertained, its proceedings were likely to be longer procrastinated, were prepared to give their consent to the canons as they stood, and, therefore, Bogerman, at the evening session, thus armed, was determined to defend all that was contained in them. In opening the session he addressed the assembly thus, "that, as to the rigid statements complained of, he wished the synod patiently to hear him. First," he asserted, "that none of the Netherland divines had ever used the expressions so complained of; and as it was a synod of the Low Countries, it did not become strangers to interfere with its decisions. Secondly, that the divines who had used them were foreigners, and, therefore, that the Churches to which they belonged, and the princes under whom they lived, might be offended if their ministers were censured by the synod." The English, however, were not to be deceived by the finesse, or silenced by the dictatorial intimations of Bogerman, and said, in opposition to him, "that the Remonstrants, in the papers they had presented to the synod, had pointed to the very pages in the books published by the Belgic divines where they had inserted these and similar offensive passages; and, consequently, the Churches of the Netherlands could not be free from such imputations unless that assembly rejected them. As to the second point, it need not consider whether the persons who maintained these opinions were Dutchmen or strangers, for if the doctrines of strangers were not to be condemned, why then did the synod condemn those of Socinus, who was not a Dutchman? or why ought the king of Great Britain to have condemned those of Vorstius, who was not his subject?" In this masterly way they met the statements of Bogerman, especially insisting upon the rejection of the following declaration,—*that no man is able to do more good nor less evil than he does,*—saying "that in the condemnation of this sentiment no reproach would be cast upon the deceased doctors of the Reformation, seeing that it was a novel doctrine which had not been broached more than seven years." The correctness of the charge alleged against the Dutch clergy by the English divines, in using the harsh and revolting statements alluded to, is proved from the fact, says Brandt, of Sibrandus himself admitting that some of the Netherland divines had taught even harsher doctrines, and used harsher expressions than those which the English had pronounced as deserving condemnation. Not being able, however, to procure such a modification of the canons as they wished, they made a kind of *vivâ voce* protest in the way of self-defence, that, if reproached for not rejecting certain abominable expressions inserted in them, they might, by appealing to it, clear themselves from being charged as accessories to them. Thus were these canons adopted by the synod; and when one of its members, Alstedius, professor of Herbern, was upbraided by Poppius and Næranus, two of the cited Remonstrants, for not condemning the horrible doctrines of Piscator and many others, he justified the synod on account of its being afraid of the displeasure of the princes of the different States where such rigid divines had lived. To which the others replied, "But did you not take an oath to judge on these matters according to the word of God? But now it appears that you and the synod have not been governed by it, seeing that worldly views and motives have influenced you, since it has not condemned doctrines which privately its members admit to be abominable. And yet you have not scrupled to condemn and reject, as intolerable, the doctrines of the Remonstrants even upon the smallest particulars, however inoffensive they may appear."

We shall now proceed to that part of the synod's transactions in which, as an ecclesiastical assembly, it pronounced, on the 24th of April, a sentence of condemnation upon the cited ministers. It was to the following effect: "That the Remonstrants,—being introducers of novelties, preachers of error, guilty of corrupting religion, creating schisms, and dissolving the unity of the Church—obstinate, disobedient, and promoters of faction —by which they have given grievous offence and caused much scandal,—be, therefore, deprived of all ecclesiastical and academical offices until they repent of their false doctrine, and are able to produce unexceptionable evidence before the Dutch Church of the sincerity of the same. And that the other Remonstrant ministers be handed over to the provincial synods, in order to see if it be possible to induce them to relinquish their doctrines; and if not, that then they be deprived of all their offices in like manner." The English, and most of the other foreign divines, refused to be parties to the passing of this sentence, or even to give their judgment upon it. Not so with the Geneva divines; they could not avoid expressing publicly and unequivocally their approval of this wholesale system of persecution and exclusion. They had not forgotten the example of the founder of their school. Old Balcanqual, to the honour of Scottish Calvinism be it said, wrote to the ambassador, Carlton, saying, "We have at length put an end to the affair of the five articles. What trouble we have had in these last sessions none can conceive but those who were present at them, and what strange carriage hath been in them, especially on the president's part, it is too palpable. He hath deceived all men's hope of him very far. All I can say is, methinks it is hard that every man should be deposed from the ministry, [that is, of the Remonstrants.] Never did any Church of old, nor any Reformed Church, propose so many articles to be held *sub pœnâ excommunicationis;* but, had it not then been cruel, if all had gone for canons which they would have had gone."

We shall pass over the business of the synod up to the 6th of May, when it assembled in the great church at Dort for the purpose of reading its canons, with the condemnation of the Remonstrants and their doctrines. On hearing this sentence read, a learned writer of that day waggishly remarked, "I can by no means understand how it has happened that all those who have convened synods have always got the better, and those whom they have cited before them have been worsted." On the evening of the same day, the cited were summoned into the presence of the lay commissioners to hear the sentence of the synod read to them, which being done, they were forbidden to leave Dort till they received orders to the contrary. Episcopius then, with unsubdued courage and manly freedom, replied in the name of all the cited persons in the following words: "Is this all, gentlemen? We thank God and our Lord Jesus Christ that he has counted us worthy to suffer reproach and shame for his sake. We know that we have acted with a good conscience, and are not guilty of the crimes laid to our charge. We are likewise satisfied, because we know by whom and for what we are thus condemned; we are condemned by our avowed enemies, as you, gentlemen, very well know, for having constantly and firmly maintained, by word of mouth and in writing, the truth which is according to godliness, and for opposing opinions which we believe to be prejudicial to holiness. We have done our duty, we have set the candle on the candlestick before your lordships and the synod. It is not our fault that you have not received the light. You must at the last day give an account of your reasons for treating us thus, and we wish that in that day you may not be dealt with as we have been by the synod: in a word, we appeal to the great Jehovah, who will judge the living and the dead, who will decide righteously, and before whom we, the synod, and your lordships are all to appear. As to our continuing here, we shall consult God and our consciences concerning it, and shall act, as respects this matter, as we may judge duty and conscience require." Their remarks were received with contempt, and one of the commissioners, a counsellor named Gregorius, sneeringly replied "that their high mightinesses, the States, did not trouble themselves about their consciences, but only required them to obey."

On the 9th of May, the synod closed its labours, terminating the whole with a splendid dinner given at the expense of the States, in which these divines were cheered after their labours with plenty of provision, wines, and fruits. Musicians were brought from the neighbouring towns to enliven the scene. The Remonstrants,—as a body smarting under the synod's condemnation, and with the prospect of two hundred of their ministers being likely to be ejected from their Churches, and thousands of their families ruined and plunged into misery, if they attended to the dictate of conscience in refusing to receive the synodical canons, which would be made more odious than the letter of them required by the mode in which they would be enforced by the provincial synods,—said, as was natural, very strong things about this feast. Brandt, though a Remonstrant divine, could but see that these circumstances were calculated to dispose them to view this affair in the worst light; and to his credit as a faithful historian be it said, he felt it to be his duty not to be instrumental in giving permanency to statements which, he conceived, owed some measure of their colouring to the painful circumstances through which they were contemplated by the suffering Remonstrants.

The synod, in commemoration of its triumphs, caused a medal to be struck. Bentham, in his *Schulen Staat*, gives a representation of it. On the one side is exhibited the Synod of Dort, around which is the following inscription, *Religione Assertâ.* On the reverse is a mount with a temple on the top of it, over which is inscribed the name of Jehovah in Hebrew. The four winds are also represented by four chubby faces, from each of which issues a stream directed toward the mount. The whole is surrounded with the following inscription, *Erunt ut mons Sion,* CIↃIↃCXIX. Several of these were struck in gold to which was appended a chain, both together being worth upward of fifteen pounds sterling. These were presented to the foreign divines. Silver ones were given to the Dutch members of the assembly. The expenses of this synod to the Dutch provinces were about one hundred thousand pounds, which, compared with the value of money at the present period, certainly was no trifling sum.

With the exception of some few of the members, as Martinius and others, the synod seemed mightily pleased with its proceedings. Old Clark,* in his Life of Antony Wallæus, says, "God so blessed the labours of all in this synod that the Remonstrants themselves had no cause to complain." Perhaps the reader will not concur in this opinion when he is made acquainted with the consequences to the Remonstrants growing out of its labours.

CHAPTER XIII.

We have now to bring before the reader an event connected with the proceedings of the Synod of Dort, and forming a part of Maurice's political arrangements for seizing hold of the reins of government, and furthering the designs of the Orange family in securing sovereign distinction. This event was the judicial assassination of Barneveldt, a man who has justly been designated one of the truest patriots of any time or country. He was distinguished by extraordinary talents, unimpeachable honour, and incorruptible integrity. "A hundred pens have been engaged" in eulogizing his memory and virtues. With the exception of William, the great prince of Orange, the father of Maurice, he contributed more than any other person to the emancipation of his country from the despotism of Spanish authority, and the cruelty of Philip's unrelenting papistical bigotry and persecution; and, like him, became a martyr for its liberties, though in a different way. William fell by the hand of a hired and authorized assassin, while Barneveldt fell at the direction of Maurice, after the mockery of a trial. His judges were commissioners selected, says a modern writer, by his enemy and murderer, the prince of Orange. So perfectly spotless were his character and conduct, that even Cross, the continuator of Grimestone, with all his prejudice against him on account of his attachment to Arminianism, says, "He was ennobled with many rich endowments, which made him honourable in the estimation of all men. After he had studied the ciuill law for some yeares, he did proceed doctor of that facultie, and did at first supplie the office of an aduocate in the lower consistories, and after that in the court of Holland. And because he was prudent, wise, and affable, which vertues raised him above the ordinarie ranke of mankind, he was chosen at first pentionarie of Rotterdam, and afterward he was made aduocate and keeper of the great seale of Holland and West Friesland. Being newly advanced to this vertical point, than which he could ascend no higher in this democratie, he increased daily in knowledge, riches, and authoritie, so that his suffrage was almost received for an oracle not onely in the prouinciall counsell of Holland, but also in the colledge of the States-Generall, most of whom were so conceited of his wisdom and integritie that no important business was concluded without his privitie. And in the progresse of time hee was grown to that power and reputation that hee was not onely courted by the great ones of this land, but by the embassadours of forreine kings, princes, and commonwealths. Hee knew the secrets of many kings and princes, which hee disclosed to none but his owne creatures."* The proof of his correspondence with kings may be seen in Næranus' *Waarachtige Historie van leven J. Van-Oldenbarneveldt*, inasmuch as in it are given letters from the various reigning monarchs of the day, such as Henry of France, the queen mother, Maria de Medici, her son Louis XIII., our Elisabeth, James, and Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, the king of Denmark, &c., several of which were written by these distinguished personages themselves, and especially those of James, expressing not merely high consideration for him, but couched in terms of amity and friendship.

---

* Marrow of Ecclesiastical History.

---

* We have thought it right to retain the style and orthography of this writer.

Singular to say, Limborch scarcely ever notices this tragical event, and Brandt himself seemed reluctant to advert to it, and especially the agency of Maurice, by which it was accomplished. Perhaps the reserve of these two Arminian clergymen on this subject arose from the fact of their living near the time when the event took place, and after the Nassau family were on the Belgic throne, by whose clemency the sect of which they were ministers was allowed the peaceable enjoyment of their religious opinions and worship. As previously stated, the refusal of Barneveldt to comply with Maurice's wish to obtain sovereignty, fixed this prince in his fatal design of ridding himself of so mighty an opponent to the accomplishment of his wishes. For this purpose he allied himself closely to the bigoted Calvinist party, who at that time were designated Gomarists. These were violent enemies of the advocate, for, according to Cross, he had, in the year 1617, discovered himself more plainly to be an Arminian. This, he intimates, was a very sufficient reason for their enmity to him; and, it appears, made him the apologist of Maurice's conduct in this dark deed. That Barneveldt had offended the High Calvinist clergy, will not be doubted when we state the following fact. Some of them had dared to interfere with the authority of the States, and in a dictatorial tone bade their high mightinesses not to oppose the earl of Leicester in his government. These divines were the patrons of our Elisabeth's favourite and unprincipled lieutenant in Holland, because he supported their bigotry and pretensions to power. Barneveldt felt that the States were insulted by this message, and bade these officious political meddling ministers "not to abandon the task of saving souls for the purpose of mixing with worldly and state affairs." This rebuke occasioned their enmity to degenerate into malignity, and they became the irreconcilable foes of this great man.

In consequence of many foul and slanderous reports being spread of this virtuous statesman and patriot, designing to introduce popery into the Belgic provinces, and deliver them up to the thraldom of Spain, which, in spite of his simple, elegant, and energetic refutation of them, were, nevertheless, received by the mob and principal

Gomarists; the prince found himself so far placed on vantage ground as to proceed to overt measures in preparing the way for the ruin of the advocate, and the accomplishment of his ultimate purpose, the attainment of all but absolute authority. The rigid Contra-Remonstrant clergy joined him in his intention of crushing this statesman, and their feelings of hostility to him were excited to the highest degree, in consequence of the opposition he made to the calling of a national synod, in which they intended to ruin the cause of the Remonstrants. And we are afraid that, while acting under the mask of religion in this affair, they allowed themselves to be governed by the foulest purposes of malevolence and revenge. Maurice, who knew how to take hold of their bigotry and enmity, enlisted them on his side by determining to appoint a national synod, and to remove all those magistrates who were in the interest of Barneveldt and the Arminians, who might oppose this design. The correctness of this statement will be seen even from Cross, who, as prejudiced in favour of the Calvinists, says "that the prince of Orange was in good hopes that the States, magistrates, and elders of Holland, who were Arminians, would not oppose themselues against his resolution concerning a national synod. But he saw and found, contrary to his expectations, that many who were abused by the aduice and counsell of John Oldenbarneveldt and other pentionaries of the Remonstrants' townes, continued obstinate in their resolutions, confederations, and proceedings. For which cause his excellencie and their lordships thought it fitting to cut off the gangrend members before it were too late, to imprison and bring to a iudiciall triall some of the ringleaders of these seditions, before their faction were growne unresistable. The principal men who were to be apprehended were the chief advocate of Holland, John Oldenbarneveldt, Rambout Van Hogerbeets, pentionarie of Leyden, and Hugo de Groots, pentionarie of Rotterdam. These were layed hold on by the lieutenant of the princes guard on the 19th of August!"

Of this event Barneveldt had previous notice, but, according to Næranus, conscious of his own innocence, he at that time would not admit it possible that so foul an outrage upon justice could be committed as the seizure of his person.* But he had soon to learn that his innocency would be no shield against the injustice of Maurice and his creatures. Unfortunately this misguided prince had called to his counsels an individual who had formerly been ambassador at the court of France, by the name of Francis Aarsens, and who was deprived of his office by the influence of Barneveldt. This circumstance filled him with rage and malevolence, and from that moment he determined on the ruin of the advocate, and felt no scruple at intimating the same. He was a man capable of infinite dissimulation, so that Cardinal Richelieu, well qualified to prize that species of talent, pronounced him to be one of the first adepts at intrigue and double-dealing.† The editors of the Modern Universal History say of him, "that he hurried on Maurice in his ill-fated measures. His aspiring ambition," they add, "scrupled to commit no action which could promote his designs. Perniciously bold and detestably eloquent, he converted the best of qualities to the worst of purposes." Yet this man was the guiding star of this prince, and under his counsels the Synod of Dort was convoked, Barneveldt murdered, Grotius condemned to spend his life in a dungeon, and the Remonstrants persecuted and banished. Though the known and avowed enemy of the advocate, he was, nevertheless, selected to be the leading person of the commissioners appointed as his judges. He was worthy of such an office, in such a tribunal, designed to commit such a deed. One of the appointed judges, conscience-smitten, wished to retire, and be rid of the awful responsibility connected with the designs of Maurice against the pensionary; but he was threatened with painful consequences if he shrunk from the task assigned him, and, dreading more the frown of the prince than the stings of conscience, he consented to stain his soul, and become a party to the legalized murder of this virtuous patriot.

On the morning of his arrest, it appears that he had too much reason to apprehend what was at hand, and being visited by Uitenbogaerdt, his faithful friend, the latter found him on entering his cabinet, not as usual, cheerful and preparing his papers for the business of the day, but sitting in gloomy sedateness, pondering on the coming storm. This amiable and pious clergyman kindly rebuked his sadness, and strove to console him. The venerable man rose, and silently embraced him. This mark of esteem was given as a farewell sign to the friend who had been his confidant and spiritual adviser in all his troubles, while it was indicative of the presentiment he laboured under that they were to see each other no more; which, alas! we believe, was too fatally realized. He then ordered his carriage for the purpose of hastening to the court house of the States of Holland, with the design, he afterward declared, of trying to induce them to give up their opposition to the calling of a national synod. By this act he had hoped to conciliate the Contra-Remonstrant party; but it was too late. They saw he was within their grasp, and nothing short of his destruction could satisfy them, and, therefore, were determined, vulturelike, to pounce upon him. As his carriage passed by Maurice's residence, it was stopped under the pretence, says the ambassador, Carlton, that the prince wished to speak with him, when the venerable man was seized by his minions. By a similar stratagem Grotius and Hoogerbeets were likewise arrested by an officer of the prince's guard.

---

* See Waarachtige Historie Van Leven J. Van Oldenbarneveldt.

† See History of the Netherlands, *Lardner's Cyclopædia*, vol. x, p. 235.

The senate by this time were assembled, when the immediate friends of Barneveldt were taunted by being asked what was to be done in this business. Overwhelmed and confounded, one of them, a curator of Leyden, replied, "You have taken from us our head, our tongue, and our hand, and, therefore, you must excuse our silence." Barneveldt was conducted to the room where the admiral of Arragon had been a prisoner eighteen years before. "Looking around it with a melancholy gaze, he lifted vp his eyes," says Cross, "and said, with a deepe sigh, 'My sonnes, my sonnes,' adding this Diuine sentence, 'God hath cast downe the high and mightie from their seat and government.' The imprisoning of these persons was presently spread abroad through the whole country, concerning which euery man conjectured according to his fancie. This restraint seemed like a solar eclipse to the Arminians, but to the true professors [that is, the Calvinists] it appeared like a comfortable sunshine after a long darknesse, the heate and influence whereof gaue motion to their hearts and tongues, so that they which before durst not discouer themselues, did now speak and write boldly against Barneueldt and his adherents. His greatest friends and favourites, whom he had advanced to most eminent dignities, and who did honour him like a god in the springtide of his fortune, upon the ebbe thereof shewed themselues emblems of humane inconstancie, and uerified by their actions that saying of the poet:—

Donec eris felix, multos numerabis amicos;
Tempora si fuerint nubila, solus eris."*

The circumstances thus named by Cross are worthy of notice, as they prove that the calling of the Synod of Dort, the fate of the Remonstrants, and fall of Barneveldt, were all parts of one comprehensive plan of persecution, originating with the rancorous bigotry of the Contra-Remonstrants. For the very day on which this synod commenced its sessions, he had his first examination; and on the day after it closed its public sittings, this victim of bigotry fell by the hand of the executioner.

His examinations, which were carried on with the utmost secresy, could elicit nothing as an occasion of just accusation; still he was not to escape the gripe of his enemies, who were his judges. Barneveldt and his friends objected to Aarsens being one of them; first, on the ground of his not being a native of the Netherlands; and, secondly, as being his known and avowed enemy: but both these objections were disregarded. In the hall where he took his trial, the prisoner usually sat upon a stool without a back, but Barneveldt, says Carlton, had a stool with a back, which was all the favour shown him in regard of his old age. They literally worried him with interrogatories, sending for him not less than sixty times in a day, to ask him questions, with the design of perplexing and confounding him, hoping thereby that he would contradict and commit himself. But in vain: he was calm, collected, and dignified, yet he saw enough to lead him to predict the worst, and said, "These are bitter folk, I have nothing to hope from them." This illustrious victim of injustice was not only prevented from seeing and having the help of his friends, but he was also deprived of legal means and aid for defending himself, and likewise of paper and pens, the necessary materials for drawing up his exculpation. The judges showed their consciousness of the iniquity of their proceedings by conducting the trial in profound secresy, so that no one could know the substance of the accusations alleged against him. It subsequently appeared, however, that the charges they did advance were most false, frivolous, and inconsistent. This arose out of the fact of there being none that had the shadow of justice or truth in them. But the very innocence of this man excited his opponents to keener vindictiveness of feeling. For it is in the nature of human depravity, when about to commit a foul crime under the colour of judicial proceedings, and the forms of law and justice are found to stand in the way, from the absence of moral delinquency in the object, that then the revengeful passions become more violent from such obstructions, and their subject, in trampling on these impediments in order to accomplish his guilty purpose, is carried to greater excess, and his victim falls by a more ruthless blow than was at first intended. This was the case with Barneveldt. He was innocent, and therefore he was to be despatched the more suddenly and violently; and that, too, before the momentary feeling of enmity, excited against him among the people, should subside, or sympathy felt by remote connections might throw obstacles in the way of the designs of his enemies. Still, however, the victim was too distinguished to pass to the scene of immolation without a mighty struggle being made to save him. France and other states interposed on his behalf, especially the former; and though insulted in its diplomatic agent by the infamous Aarsens, so as to occasion the ambassador of Louis to demand his passports, and nobly to refuse a bribe which was offered him to induce him to stay, yet its sovereign, when hearing of the probable fate of the pensionary, sent a letter to him while yet on the road to Paris, commanding him instantly to return, and submit to the affront, in order that by his presence he might use his utmost endeavours with the prince and his creatures to save the life of the advocate. The princess dowager wished to see Maurice, to entreat him to spare this aged and venerable statesman; but, aware of her intention, he refused to see her. This lady then urged the wife of Barneveldt to throw herself at the feet of the prince, and crave pardon for her husband; but this high-minded woman refused to do it, lest it might be supposed that by such an act she gave the appearance of sanction to the alleged guilt of her husband, while she was equally aware that the vindictive spirit of Maurice would glean satisfaction from her humility, without his being in the least moved to compassion.*

---

* We shall give Cross's version of these well known lines on account of its quaintness,—

Whilst you are rich you shall haue friends good store,
But they will baulke you when youre fortune's poore.

It is painful to know that, while the sympathies of princes and statesmen were excited on behalf of Barneveldt, that our James, who had been accustomed to address him in terms of familiarity, concluding letters written to him by his own hand with *votre bien mon ami* JACQUES R, now through petty piques and the *odium theologicum*, could see him sink without lifting up his voice in the way of remonstrance against the iniquitous conduct of Maurice. Nay, it would appear that Carlton, who, in imitation of his master, professed to be very wise in theological lore, and who was the enemy of the Remonstrants, and the chief instrument in obtaining the appointment of the Synod of Dort, must, we are afraid, be considered an accessory to the imprisonment and death of the pensionary. This appears from Cross, who says, "Sir Dudley Carlton's industrie deserves an honourable commendation for the discovering of Barneveldt's designs;" a statement which relates to the conduct of the ambassador as connected with the advocate's arrest, which accounts for his viewing the proceedings of the judges, and the death of this statesman, in a way that was significant of his approval, rather than of his disapprobation.

The strong feeling excited in favour of this Dutch patriot tended to hasten his death, by occasioning his enemies flagrantly to violate all the decencies of judicial proceeding; for while he was actually preparing his final defence, the court came to a hasty judgment on his case; and, on the same evening, an officer was hurried to the place of his confinement, to inform him that sentence of death was to be passed upon him; when the astonished man, whose thoughts had been previously turned upon preparing his exculpation, twice exclaimed, "Sentence of death! sentence of death! I had thought to have been heard again," adding, "it is for my judges to answer before God for their conduct." He then demanded pens, ink, and paper, that he might write a farewell letter to his wife. No Remonstrant clergyman was allowed to visit him; but Wallæus, named at page 45, was selected for this work. This man, who was eminent for talent, and had been in the closest bonds of intimacy with some of the Arminians, had sufficient feeling and veneration for their patron to shrink from the task assigned him; so that when sent for by the States-General from Dort to the Hague, to attend Barneveldt under these melancholy circumstances, he reluctantly consented, having first obtained a promise that he should be spared the pain of witnessing his death. And fearing that a similar fate was designed for Grotius, to whom he owed much, and with whom he had been on the most intimate terms, he stipulated, at the same time, that he should not be the bearer of any painful message to him.* Wallæus may have concurred in some of the measures of his party, which were marked by bigotry and injustice, yet when we know that Heinsius, Deodatus, and other members of the synod were engaged in furthering the death of Barneveldt, and sportingly and impiously exulting over it, one is pleased, amid so much cruelty and ruthless feeling evinced by some of the Dutch clergy, to see an individual so far maintaining unimpaired the best sympathies of the heart, as to shrink from being the witness of an act the result of fanaticism, religious faction, and the despotism of military power. We deem it right to make this statement in vindication of Wallæus, because his conduct in this business has been otherwise represented by modern writers. This minister's arrival seemed at first unwelcome to the condemned man, and his offers of attention were courteously declined. Some have attributed this to a species of unkind officiousness in Wallæus to obtrude his particular theological views upon him. We can but hope otherwise, although some circumstances attendant upon the case might seem to bear such a construction. The fact is, the mind of the venerable victim was overwhelmed with pain.* The sentence had come upon him so unexpectedly and suddenly, and while he was preparing his defence, that he for a time could only dwell on the iniquity of his judges and the murderous proceedings adopted against him, seeing that he was wickedly to be deprived of life without making his full defence.

---

* Grattan's History of the Netherlands.

---

* Life of Wallæus.

Soldiers were placed in his chamber to prevent him from speaking even to his servant. The Spanish inquisition itself, the arbitrary and bloody jurisdiction of which this distinguished statesman, in conjunction with William, the first prince of Orange, had so successfully opposed, and rescued the Low Countries from its tyranny, never conducted a trial and execution with more injustice, secresy, or rigour. And while he continued to reflect on these things, he was incapable of composing his mind, for the purpose of entering upon acts of devotion. That he should refuse, in the first instance, the offers of Wallæus and some other ministers that were with him on the mournful occasion, is not surprising. He knew that the plots of the party to which they belonged had, by their intrigues, their bigotry, and violence, in concurrence with Maurice, who was their great supporter, brought the sentence of death upon him. The guards having refused to allow him to speak to his servant, he endeavoured to put away the pain of the moment, arising from such treatment, by bidding him read the Psalms to him in French. Thus the night passed away. His wife, after receiving his farewell letter, requested to see him, a fact he was not distinctly made acquainted with. And not till within an hour or two of his execution was it intimated to him that he might be permitted to see her, when he was asked if he wished to see any friend. He replied that such a question came too late, as such an interview would only serve to trouble and unman him in his last moments. One blushes to relate it, but all this was taking place while the members of the Synod of Dort were receiving their gold and silver medals, in token of the States' approval of their conduct, and rejoicing at the close of their labours, at a festive scene provided for them by the same parties.

---

* Life of Wallæus.

On the following morning, being the 13th of May, the last act of this tragedy was performed, by the sacrifice of this innocent victim, to serve as the seal of sanction to the synod's labours. Brought into the presence of his judges, the sentence was read, in which, among other things, he was charged with *troubling religion and vexing the Church of God*, for which he was to die. This sentence ended thus: "That the said John Oldenbarneveldt shall be conveyed from hence to the place of execution, there to have his head cut off by the sword of justice, [what awful mockery!] and his goods to be confiscated." "He received this sentence of death," says Cross, "with an undaunted countenance, and when it was finished, he said, 'I was in good hopes that your lordships would haue beene satisfied with my bloud, and by reason of my long seruice would leaue my goods to my wife and children.'" These last words he uttered with a faint voice and dejected countenance, but being informed by the president that he must submit himself to his sentence, he resumed his firmness, and rising from his seat was immediately conducted through the great hall to the scaffold. The hall was full of his friends and acquaintances. He took no notice of any of them as he passed, and continued to bear himself with the same grandeur and serenity on his way to the scaffold,* leaning on his staff and supported by his servant. When he arrived there he asked, "Is there no cushion or stool for me to kneel on?" and then kneeling down on the rough boards he prayed for a while. He then rose and began to prepare himself, saying, while pointing to the executioner, "That man need not touch me." Before kneeling down to receive the fatal stroke, he addressed the people, exclaiming aloud, "Good citizens, do not believe that I die a traitor, but on the contrary a true patriot;" and then kneeling down, lifted up his hands toward heaven and said, "Christ is my guide; Lord, have mercy upon me; Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;"† when the executioner instantly struck off his head at one blow. And thus fell this distinguished statesman and Christian. Many of the people instantly rushed to the spot, and dipped their handkerchiefs in his blood. "His remains were shortly after borne away in a poore vnpolished coffin, and he was buried by the executioners, in the chapell of the inner court, without any assistance of friends or kinsfolkes."*

---

* Crowe.

† Cross.

Maurice, it is said, gratified his revenge by witnessing this tragedy from a window of an octagonal tower which overlooks the square where it took place; but the writer of the History of the Netherlands in Lardner's Cyclopædia, chooses to doubt the truth of this statement. The reason he assigns for so doing is honourable to his feelings, as he thereby wishes to rescue the character of this prince from such a blot, by doubting his capability of manifesting so much malignity and revenge. But surely he had forgotten that religious and political enmity will lead men to strange deeds. Has it escaped his memory, that Gardner would not dine till he learned that the martyrs were burned, and then sat down with brutal pleasure to gratify his appetite? or did he forget, at the time he penned this statement, the playful foolery of Cromwell, when signing the death warrant of Charles, acts which prove that a man can sportingly trifle while occasioning the death of an antagonist, or enjoy malicious satisfaction at seeing the fall of a rival under his own appointment? We are afraid there is too much truth in this charge against Maurice, and in a representation of the advocate's execution in the *Leven Van Barneveldt*, by Næranus, the very window is exhibited in which Maurice is shown sitting, and certain words proceeding from him, which it is not necessary for us to translate; only we may remark that they are expressive of his approval, while beholding this act of judicial assassination. Still, Mr. Colley Grattan may be correct in his supposition of Maurice being incapable of witnessing the scene, and for the honour of human nature we hope he is. Nevertheless, we have deemed it right to give the above statement of Barneveldt's biographer. There is another circumstance we beg leave to notice, because it may have startled the reader, that is, the designating the execution of Barneveldt as being an act of murder. In doing this we have followed cotemporary writers, and, in support of the propriety of thus imitating them, we beg leave to give the statement of an Italian civilian, who says, "that to bring a charge and not to be able to prove it, makes the judges who condemn him that is arraigned, not judges, but executioners."* Allowing this opinion to be correct, we leave it with the reader to say whether the commissioners who sat at Barneveldt's mock trial, and Maurice who appointed them and it, are not justly liable to bear the stigma which is thus attached to the mode in which they despatched the victim of their cruelty and injustice.

---

* Cross.

From the moment of the completion of this iniquitous act, the star of Maurice set, and he who had been justly deemed the first tactician of his age, and whose camp had been crowded by the young nobility of various countries to take lessons from him in the art of war, was foiled in almost all his measures. His countenance was marked by a gloomy aspect, indicative of the anxiety, chagrin, and agony, to which his mind was subject. The circumstances attending his exercise of authority were calculated to produce this state of feeling. The people, who, it appears, had stood by and beheld Barneveldt's murder in silent astonishment, were now roused from their apathy. The military deeds of the prince, which had been splendid, were lost sight of, and instead of his being hailed as a deliverer, he was detested as a tyrant. In passing through the cities of the States, nothing was heard, but murmurs, or the name of Barneveldt uttered in a way significant of the people's disapprobation of Maurice. A plot was laid for his life, which brought other victims under his implacable resentment. One of these was the son of the late advocate, who sought to revenge the death of his father. The execution of the conspirators excited more pity for the sufferers, than rejoicing at Maurice's escape from their design. This he saw, and it deeply affected him. It spoke more than volumes, as to the opinion of the people on his conduct in relation to Barneveldt. Baffled in his efforts to relieve Breda, the patrimonial inheritance of the Orange family, which was invested by Spinola—foiled in an attempt upon Antwerp—witnessing the silent disrespect of the citizens, instead of their wonted acclamations—the laurels he had won, fading on his brow, and the memory of the people affectionately turned to the victim of his ambition; while a medal was struck to celebrate his virtues, by which he was held up as a martyr for the liberties of his country—were events which, as they preyed on his mind, generated a feverish anxiety, and operated as incipient disease, that marked him as one speedily to fall the victim of his own folly, injustice, and tyranny; and not long after the execution of Barneveldt, he was seized with a lingering malady, which, says Mr. Grattan, it is hoped, for the sake of his better feelings, was accompanied with regret and remorse for the past. The intimation here thrown out by this writer is confirmed by the testimony of others, though in proof of the salutary character of the remorse we have not the same weight of evidence; and in the absence of those feelings which, though to a great extent undefinable, yet form a source of solace and hope to the true penitent, we are afraid he was taught to rely upon the admission of certain theological sentiments as the ground of safety and acceptance with his Maker when passing from the presence of man and the twilight of time to the bright visions of eternity. In confirmation of this statement, we shall mention a circumstance which took place previous to the death of this unhappy prince. Struggling with his own feelings under a remembrance of the past, he had an interview with Bogerman, to whom he stated the secret misgivings of his heart as to his safety, and the uneasiness he felt at the idea of entering the awful presence of his Judge. Bogerman attempted to console him by the application of promises suited to the case of the penitent. "But," asked the prince, "how can these passages of Scripture, which promise grace and pardon to penitents, apply to me, since I do not discover in myself any of the true signs of repentance or contrition?" To which the minister rejoined, "But do you not feel a wish to repent?" "Certainly I do," said the other. "Then," added Bogerman, "such a wish to be able to repent is an infallible sign of regeneration."*

---

* See Bayle's Dictionary; article, Louis the Eleventh.

On a review of this case, in connection with other events distinguishing the previous history of this prince, it is impossible for us not to see a striking resemblance between him and our countryman, Cromwell, the circumstances of whose life and death seem to be so very similar to those of Maurice. Cromwell, it is true, was undistinguished by princely descent, while his chief crime was that of being the prime instrument in the death of royalty itself. Maurice, on the contrary, was eminent by birth, while the victim of his ambition was great, only as talents, virtue, patriotism, and eminent services gave him greatness. But Charles and Barneveldt* each alike stood in the way of aspirants to sovereign authority and government; and though the Dutch statesman and the English monarch were different in rank, yet each fell the victim of the ambition of a successful soldier. Oliver, disconsolate and agitated, when viewing the past, as he was hastening to his final hour, was also consoled by his ghostly comforters in a way similar to Prince Maurice. For when feeling in himself no meltings of compunction or cheering confidence in the Divine favour, he was called away from solicitude to obtain them, by an intimation that he was placing himself under a covenant of works, which is fatal to him who attempts it. Let not the reader suppose that in thus briefly noticing these striking points of coincidence in the conduct and end of these successful and aspiring chieftains, we thereby intend to intimate that their hyper-Calvinism was the occasion of their vices; only we may be permitted to remark that Bishop Womack, when descanting upon the conduct of Cromwell's chaplain, in thus attempting to produce the calm of confidence in his mind, so similar to the conduct of Bogerman in the case of Maurice, justly designates such acting as "the result of false principles."

---

* See Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ et Theologicæ, p. 811.

---

* Sir James Mackintosh, speaking of the murder of John and Cornelius de Witt, says, "It was perpetrated with such brutal ferocity, and encountered with such heroic serenity, that it may almost seem to be doubtful, whether the glory of having produced such pure sufferers may not, in some degree, console a country for having given birth to assassins so atrocious. These excesses are singularly at variance with the calm and orderly character of the Dutch; but it is mere justice to observe that their commonwealth was fruitful in great men, who acted and suffered with equal dignity in those tragic scenes, of which the contemplation strengthens and exalts human nature. Perhaps no free state has, in proportion to its magnitude, contributed more amply than it to the amendment of mankind by the examples of public virtue."—*History of the Revolution in* 1688, p. 316.

CHAPTER XIV.

Before proceeding to notice the sentence of banishment pronounced upon the cited Remonstrants, we can but remark that we have been struck with the heroism they displayed, in protesting against the illegitimacy of the synod as their judge, though they knew that it was appointed by the dictum of Maurice. This courage appears still more striking when it is known that reports of the probable execution of the imprisoned Barneveldt were conveyed to them for the purpose of terrifying them into submission. But while their heroism commanded our admiration, we were disposed to believe that it might contribute to hasten the fall of that distinguished statesman, as being their principal support. This impression we discovered to be correct, for in turning to Sir Dudley Carlton's letter of the sixteenth of April, we found that he plainly declares "that from the commencement of the process against Barneveldt until now there was no speech of death; but now the consideration of the opinionatrity of the Remonstrants hath much altered the business, and most voices run upon making all sure," [that is, to give sentence of death upon all the prisoners.] Thus Maurice, who had pledged himself to the wife of Barneveldt that her husband's life should not be taken, now found his jealousy and vindictive passions quickened from the supposition that in this the Remonstrants openly opposed him, and that the cited assumed such bearing in the synod from encouragement from without; and, therefore, took the fatal resolution of proceeding to the lengths narrated in our last chapter. One would fain not identify any of the ministers of religion or members of the synod with this foul deed, but broad intimations had been given by many of them of the necessity of such extreme measures, and the fact of some of them afterward calling upon the people from the pulpit to rejoice after the execution of the advocate, at the deliverance of the Church from one of its greatest enemies,* and the profane sporting of Diodati on the occasion, with the odious colours in which many of the Contra-Remonstrant writers attempted to hold up this distinguished Dutchman to public execration, seem too much like laboured efforts at vilifying the memory of this victim, in order to prove the justice of the proceedings adopted against him, in which they were involved, and to establish their own righteousness in contributing to his death, by attempting to demonstrate his guiltiness.

We now proceed to the Remonstrants, who, after the lay commissioners had read to them the condemnation of the ecclesiastical president, were left unnoticed until the twentieth of May, when they were summoned into the presence of these gentlemen, who were directed to ascertain from them whether they would desist from the discharge of their ministerial duties. They were accordingly asked individually by their lordships, "whether, since they had been deprived of their ministry, they would abstain from all ecclesiastical ministrations, such as preaching, exhorting, administering the sacrament, and visiting the sick;" promising them, at the same time, that if they would cease from attending to these duties, a comfortable competency should be allowed them to live as private citizens. Beside the above requirement, it was especially demanded of Episcopius that he should promise neither to write letters, nor books, in order to confirm the people in the opinions of the Remonstrants, and draw them away from the doctrine of the synod. We need not say that the speciality of the request made to Episcopius thus to impose silence upon him, was paying high homage to the vast powers of his mind. The men answered like themselves, save one: "We are ready to obey their high mightinesses, so far as we can do it with a safe conscience, but beyond this, we can make no promises. We will desist from attempts to preach in churches belonging to the government, but not to minister elsewhere to large or small assemblies of those who are attached to us, we cannot engage. When we took upon us holy orders, we bound ourselves to our Lord Jesus Christ to preach his word both in prosperity and adversity, and we dare not recall our vows. We know that punishment awaits him who hides his talent through terror, as well as him who squanders it through neglect. It is our duty, therefore, to place our lights upon a candlestick, and not put them under a bushel through fear; and we hope your lordships will neither attempt to hinder us, or be displeased with us for so doing." "But," said one of the commissioners, "suppose a proclamation is issued to prevent you." "We hope better things," it was replied, "from their high mightinesses, than that they should attempt such measures in these free Netherlands. Nevertheless, should it be so, we are bound to obey God rather than man." A second time they were summoned into the presence of the commissioners, who again attempted to induce them to promise to desist, but they remained unmoved in their former determination.

---

* See Brandt.

The friends of the cited now began to be alarmed, apprehending that violent measures would be adopted against them, and wished them to seek their safety in flight. But they had too much manly courage to listen to these suggestions. Uitenbogaerdt was tremblingly alive to the danger which he thought hung over Episcopius, and in writing to him, said, "It is well known in what esteem the opposite party hold you, and there is no doubt but they will endeavour to adopt measures to cast you into prison, or send you into exile. If I were fully certain that the latter was to be the extent of their designs upon you, I should exhort you to submit to it; but if there is a probability of the former, I say do not forget the case of the lord advocate." By this remark it is evident Uitenbogaerdt wished Episcopius to escape, which he easily could have done, but he refused, and, therefore, with the rest of the Remonstrants, went to the Hague, on the second of July, to receive his sentence. Prior to this, however, they addressed both the States of Holland and the States-General, on the injustice of their being detained at Dort so long after the synod had closed; asserting that, as a safe conduct had been promised to them, they hoped that their governors would not violate their promises, otherwise they would act more unjustly than the Catholics did at the Council of Trent, who kept their engagements with the Protestants; and, therefore, they entreated their high mightinesses to release them; but their petitions were disregarded. On the fifth of July, being summoned into the anti-chamber of the building where the States-General were assembled, they were requested to sign what was called *The Act of Cessation*, but refusing so to do, sentence was pronounced upon them, of which the closing part runs thus: "That, in consequence of their contumacy and disobedience, the cited," whose names are then given, "shall be conducted by certain officers appointed by their high mightinesses out of the United Provinces, without ever being allowed to come or return thither, till the said States shall be fully satisfied that they are willing to subscribe the same act, and leave be given them to return, on pain of being treated as disturbers of the public peace, for an example to others." This sentence being pronounced, they were ordered to withdraw; but the Remonstrants desired a copy of it, which being promised them, Episcopius then spoke in the name of the cited, and among other statements he said: "We are free from the charges advanced against us, and have acted in relation to the synod with a good conscience, as in the presence of the Lord; and it seems strange to us that we should be banished from our country, and forbidden ever to return, the more especially as we were invited to a free synod, frequently promised a safe conduct, and that no injury should befall us on account of the defence we might there make of our cause. This we depended upon; but, on the contrary, we have been kept eight months from our families, and are now to be banished because we refuse to do that which our consciences cannot approve. But since it is your lordships' pleasure, we must submit, and commend ourselves and cause to God. May the Lord, whom we serve, judge between you and us." No reply was made to this address; and they were instantly ordered away, and secured under lock and bolt.

Shortly after, a messenger was sent to them, to know to what place each would be conducted. They replied "that in so short a period they could not give an answer, but should wish to consult with their wives and friends, and set their affairs in order. Their lordships replied to this answer, that two of them might be sent to convey the wishes of the rest. Niellius and Dwinglo, who were sent for this purpose, requested for themselves and their brethren permission to go home, adjust their affairs, and provide for their families; promising that they would return at a time appointed. But instead of this being granted, they were taunted and sneered at, by being told "that they need not be so concerned about their families, for if they had received an extraordinary call from God to serve his Church, they might be certain that he would provide for them in an extraordinary manner." This was said in allusion to their having declared that they could not lay down their offices as ministers, being called of God. They were farther told that it was judged right thus to treat them, on account of their contumacy, and especially for the boldness with which Episcopius had spoken in the synod. These gentlemen, however, promised to allow them to return to their lodgings, if they would engage not to speak to any person, and be ready to depart the next morning at four o'clock. They said they would comply with their wishes as far as was possible, but they could not prevent their friends from coming to see them. They were dismissed about nine o'clock, when they hastened to their lodgings, where they found a vast number of their friends waiting to sympathize with them, who, with tears and other signs of ardent affection, showed how much they were distressed by the iniquitous proceedings instituted against them. Others continued to come even till midnight, for the purpose of bidding them farewell. The same evening the States sent some officers with the money due to them. They were paid in rix-dollars. One of these, given to Episcopius, was coined in the dukedom of Brunswick; and when the reader learns the device upon it, he will at least think it singular that it should be paid to Episcopius at such a period. On the one side was the image of TRUTH, represented treading upon two figures; on one was inscribed *Calumnia*, on the other *Mendacium*; over the head of the image were stamped the following words, *Veritas vincit omnia*. On the reverse of this was struck in large letters the following inscription, *Recte faciendo neminem timeas*. Episcopius in examining this rix-dollar, was struck with the coincidence between his condition and the sentiments that it expressed, and could but devoutly acknowledge the circumstance to be the result of providential interference, seeing that those who had thus persecuted him for well-doing in defence of the truth, and the dictates of his conscience, and had resolved to banish him from his native land, should, in furnishing him with money to defray his expenses in going into exile, present him with a coin, the inscription and figures of which should be so expressively appropriate, and calculated to cheer him in his oppressed situation. To perpetuate the memory of this incident, he had this piece of money placed in a frame of gold, and it is preserved, says Limborch, as an heir loom in the family, to pass from one generation to another.

On the sixth of July the Remonstrants were ready to depart at four o'clock. At six, an officer from the States arrived, with a copy of their sentence, requesting to know the place to which each would be conducted. Eleven of them, among whom was Episcopius, wished to go to Walwick, in Brabant. Much time was lost in preparing their conveyances, and crowds assembled around their lodgings, expressing their affection for them in the most striking manner. This occasioned their being rebuked for delaying their departure, which, however, did not originate with them, their wagons not having arrived. At nine, and during a tremendous shower of rain, they were borne away from the Hague, amid the scoffs of some, and the tears of many, to the different places they had chosen. Episcopius and his brethren arrived at Walwick, in Brabant, on the seventh, and signed a document of their safe arrival at the request of the officers, and sent back a message to the States indicative of their love of their country, and their piety as Christians, in promising to pray for the States-General, which, we are afraid, if received at all, would only meet with the sneer of contempt.

After the Remonstrants had been some time in Walwick, they were visited by their friends from all parts of the Dutch provinces, who encouraged them, and furnished them with the means of support. The lord of Walwick was extremely kind to them, using his influence with the bishop of Bois-le-duc, under whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction the place was, to allow them to stay, which, on the application of the Remonstrants to the bishop, was readily and courteously granted. On that occasion the bishop invited Episcopius and Niellius, with others of their brethren, to dine with him, which they politely refused, fearing that their enemies in Holland would take advantage of their compliance, and thereby injure them.* But the bishop subsequently repeating this invitation, and promising them, at the same time, that no disputable matter should be introduced at his table, they deemed it right to wait upon him, where they found two Jesuits, two Dominicans, a licentiate canon, and the father confessor of the nuns of that place. The bishop received them in the most courteous and friendly manner, shaking hands with them, and saying in the presence of these Catholics, "I welcome you here, brethren: I call you brethren, for though we differ in many points, yet we all seek for salvation through one and the same Christ. Your oppression is a source of heartfelt grief to me. The duke of Alva, by his rigorous and cruel persecutions, has done great mischief to the Catholic religion, and seriously injured our affairs. And if the States find their advantage in imitating conduct which has been ruinous to us, it will be matter of surprise." Of course the proceedings of the Synod of Dort were spoken of at the table, when the bishop said "the Remonstrants had great injustice done them; that they had been made to suffer on account of doctrines which were sound, and easy of apprehension; while those they opposed were dishonourable to the character of God, and directly contrary to his beneficence and love, which, under a pretence of vindicating his grace toward a few, exhibit him as exercising the foulest tyranny against the many. And of all the errors in the world," he said, "to these it was that he had the strongest abhorrence." The two Jesuits of course agreed, and enjoyed this statement, which directly attacked the sentiments of the Dominicans, while the latter writhed with mortification, which was manifest in their countenances;

---

* Niellius, who, from his age, was the patriarch of the party, and whose singular courage and strict conscientiousness always led to a peculiar straightforwardness in his conduct, told his brethren, in the first instance, "that he would as soon undergo a year's imprisonment as be one of the bishop's guests, inasmuch as he knew that it would be turned to their injury by their small friends, the Contra-Remonstrants, in Holland.' —*Brandt.*

and being incapable of retaining themselves, they said "that the errors of the Calvinists were to be opposed with discretion, otherwise there was danger of adopting those of the Pelagians." The bishop answered, "In this case I have no regard to the niceties and subtleties of the schools; but, in my opinion, to assert *that God is angry with men, and damns them for a fault which they cannot possibly avoid*, is an abominable blasphemy." The Jesuits nodded assent, and looked with a smile of approval to the visiters. The Dominicans, on the contrary, were ready to burst with rage, though they durst not reply. But they vented their spleen against the Remonstrants by exciting the village pastor against them, he having adopted the opinions of the Dominicans. On the following Sunday, he openly abused them, so as to make their situation very uncomfortable, the people now treating them with rudeness. The lord of Walwick, however, unknown to the Remonstrants, spoke to the pastor, who was determined still to defame them; and, therefore, he informed the bishop, who summoned this priest before him, and forbade his preaching, because he would not promise to refrain from abusing these gentlemen; and the next Sunday sent in his place a learned monk, to counteract the effects of the statements of the former pastor. In addressing the people he exhorted them, "as good Catholics, to show to these strangers all charity and kindness. In Holland," said he, "if a priest or Jesuit is seen, who is known to be such, the ministers excite the people to abuse him;—show that you know how to act a more Christian part. These strangers have some errors, the fruit of their education; nevertheless, the opinion for which they especially suffer, is a true and ancient Catholic doctrine."

As the Remonstrants had apprehended, so their enemies in Holland made the courteous treatment of the bishop of Bois-le-duc an occasion of charge against them, asserting that they had taken an oath to desist from all ecclesiastical functions, though they had refused to do the same, when it was requested of them by the States-General; proving that, in the latter case, this act was not a matter of conscience, but a haughty rejection of the requirement of the constituted authorities of their own country. The Remonstrants, hearing this, deemed it necessary for their own vindication to apply to the lord of Walwick for testimonials contradictory of this report, which he readily granted, in which he declared "that neither he nor the bishop had ever demanded, or intended to demand any such thing from them." This letter is given by Limborch, but we think it not necessary to insert it in our pages.

About this time Episcopius published two works against the Synod of Dort, one in Latin, entitled, *Synodi Dordracenæ crudelis iniquitas*, the second in Dutch, *Antidotum, ofte Naerder openinge van het eygene gevoelen des Nationalen Synodi gehouden binnen Dordrecht*, which he afterward translated into Latin. Of the former work the celebrated Mr. Wesley says: "Looking for a book in our college library, I took down, by mistake, the works of Episcopius; which opening on an account of the Synod of Dort, I believed it might be useful to read it through. But what a scene is here disclosed! What a pity it is, that the *holy Synod* of Trent and that of Dort did not sit at the same time, so nearly allied as they were in *the spirit* wherewith they acted, if the latter did not exceed!"

By this time many other Remonstrant ministers were deprived of their offices, and became exiles. When these banished clergymen attempted to seek an asylum in those countries where the Calvinist or Reformed were the masters, they were instantly and cruelly expelled. If they fled to Catholic countries, where the Dutch States had any influence, they applied to the governors to eject them, requesting, at the same time, that no Arminians should be allowed to take shelter among them. In consequence of this, some of the other exiles, of whom there were about eighty, joined their brethren in Walwick. In the month of August several of them left this place for Antwerp, that, in conjunction with Uitenbogaerdt and Grevinchovius, they might make arrangements for supplying the spiritual wants of their congregations, which, in consequence of the late persecutions, were deprived of their pastors. A meeting was held in September, when forty-two of the banished ministers were present. Uitenbogaerdt was appointed president, Episcopius his assistant, and Grevinchovius the secretary. They were also elected joint directors of their affairs. Each minister was asked if he still continued attached to the doctrines contained in their five articles, when every one answered in the affirmative. They then entered into an engagement to meet the wants of their Churches by administering instruction, and discharging other duties belonging to the pastoral office. It was then asked, Who is willing, in the face of persecution and suffering, to return to the United Provinces in order to serve our Churches? Uitenbogaèrdt, Episcopius, and Grevinchovius instantly offered themselves; but it was deemed proper that their offer should not be accepted, as also a similar proposal from Poppius, Niellius, and Corvinus. The above six gentlemen, it was thought, would more essentially serve their cause by continuing at Antwerp, in order to prepare certain writings necessary to the defence of their doctrines, which might assist those who were about to depart for Holland. These, with their ejected brethren in the Provinces, and others who were banished, made a total of nearly two hundred.

We shall subsequently advert to the sufferings and imprisonment of many of these noble-minded men, who, in spite of all the rigorous and cruel persecutions which Calvinistic bigotry could inflict, boldly communicated instruction to their flocks. At this meeting it was resolved that if any of their brother ministers should be cast into prison, his wife and children should have the same portion allotted to them out of the common stock as was allowed to him while engaged in the public ministry. They also drew up the following declaration, promising to abide by its directions. "Forasmuch as the doctrine of truth, for which we all of us suffer in common, is a doctrine according to godliness, we agree that every one of us shall do his utmost to attain the enjoyment of true piety and holiness, and avoid whatever may tend to give offence, or occasion scandal. That each of us will strive against all anger, violence, bitterness, and unbecoming expressions; all improper conduct and behaviour; all excess in eating and drinking; and try to promote similar conduct in others over whom we may have any influence. And wherever we discover a violation of the rules of piety, he who is acquainted with such a fact, shall first, in private, admonish the offending party in a friendly, but very serious manner; nevertheless, if this be found insufficient, and the offender will not regard such admonition, he shall then be brought before the brotherhood, in order that he may be convicted of the wrong; and, if he still refuse to hear admonition, he then be accounted unworthy of our society." These and several other regulations, which bespeak the piety of these persecuted pastors, and their unflinching determination to serve their churches, in the prospect of suffering, privation, persecution, and perpetual imprisonment, bring them before us as men possessing the most lofty and unbending principles of piety, accompanied with the spirit and courage of the martyr.

After the departure of these devoted and zealous ministers appointed to join their brethren in the Netherlands, who had not yet been expelled or imprisoned, the six who were left behind as directors occupied themselves in preparing for publication such writings as were deemed necessary for the vindication and furtherance of their cause. Their first publication was the *Acta et Scripta Synodalia Remonstrantium,* so often referred to in these pages. The preface to this volume, says Mr. Nichols, is a remarkably clever performance, and every way worthy of the holy cause which Episcopius and his colleagues defended. This work, which embraces a reply to every argument that had, up to that period, been employed against their principles, is exceedingly valuable, and even their enemies admitted, in allusion to the articles it contained, that they had defended themselves with greater ability than at the Hague conference. The Calvinist clergy manifested great opposition to its publication, and the magistrates were incited to send particular orders to every Dutch bookseller who was expected to attend the Frankfort fair of 1620, not to import any copies of it. They had just reason to dread its circulation, for such an expose of their horrid statements, and such a manly refutation of their harsh doctrines, had never before appeared.

Shortly after the publication of this work, it was deemed proper that a Confession of Faith should be drawn up, bearing the following title: *Confessio, sive Declaratio Sententiæ Pastorum qui in fœderato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur, super præcipuis articulis Religionis Christianæ.* Some time, however, elapsed before this work was accomplished. This arose out of the sensitiveness of several of the ministers on the subject of confessions and canons, seeing that they were suffering severely from the rigid and dogmatical manner in which a similar instrument had been previously used by the Contra-Remonstrants against them. And as men smarting under the effects of such measures, it was very natural for some of them to say "that Confessions, though generally composed with the purest intentions, and without any design of their being made the occasion of persecution on the part of the composers, had, nevertheless, in most instances, after a lapse of time, been made instrumental in such a result." But to this it was replied that means might be adopted to prevent it, while it was expedient to produce a confession in the way of self-defence, since the Contra-Remonstrant ministers were endeavouring to make them hated by their own Churches and people, by spreading reports that they dare not make a public declaration of their sentiments; for in so doing they would have to publish the most revolting errors. It was therefore resolved, in order to refute such charges, that a confession should be composed and published; but to prevent its becoming an occasion of persecution at any future period, a preface should accompany it, in which the right use and end of such confessions should be stated, their authority described, the manner in which they ought to be received, and, in their case, to be considered only as declarative of the opinions of those who published and adopted it. And that its doctrines should always be considered as subject to examination by the word of God, and binding upon no person, any farther than he judged it to be in accordance with the same.

In this preface it is expressly stated "that the Remonstrants wish that this declaration of their sentiments should never be examined until this preface has been read." The persons chosen by the brethren to draw it up were Uitenbogaerdt, Episcopius, Grevinchovius, and Niellius; but since a work of this kind, says Limborch, must chiefly devolve upon one person, Episcopius was requested by the other three to undertake it, who immediately engaged in the task assigned him, drew up a Confession, and presented it to the other three ministers. These gentlemen, after frequently and carefully reading and examining it, were perfectly satisfied with it. They then sent for seven ministers to Antwerp, to whom they submitted it for examination, and subsequently for twenty-seven others, for a similar purpose. They afterward forwarded it to several of their brethren in Holland, and especially to those who were confined in common jails and other prisons, as likewise to Hoogerbeets, formerly pensionary of Leyden, who was imprisoned in the Louvestein; all of whom declared their approval of it. Only two ministers objected to it, and that on the ground of their being altogether opposed to the publication of a confession, asserting that it was an infringement upon Christian liberty; but as they had left the Remonstrants, or had refused to act with them, their opinion was deemed of no authority; and, therefore, it was resolved that the Confession should be instantly published. Grotius, after he had escaped from prison* to Antwerp, hastily read it, and on his arrival at

---

* The escape of Grotius by a stratagem of his wife, who sent him out of prison locked up in a chest, which was accustomed to be filled with books, is too well known to be repeated here, and is only mentioned with the design of showing that in more instances than the above, the good ladies of the imprisoned Remonstrants became the means of the escape of their husbands.

Sapma, a minister, had arranged it with his wife that she should come into the prison about four o'clock in the afternoon, with her face wrapped up, as if she had the tooth-ache. When it grew dark, he then put on her clothes, bound up his face, and put her wedding ring on that hand with which he intended to hold up a handkerchief to his face, and having put on his wife's veil, sallied forth, dreadfully alarmed lest the keeper's wife, a cunning old woman, should detect the bad fit of his dress. The old dame addressed some comforting words to the supposed sufferer, when Sapma's wife's sister, who was with him, made signs that he was not capable of speaking through pain, and in this way he escaped. "Never," said he, can I describe the confusion of transport I felt when I heard the prison door shut after me;" and, bursting into thanksgivings, he praised God for his deliverance. He nevertheless declared that in leaving his good wife behind, he still remained above half in prison.

Another made his escape by seizing the keys of the prison while the daughter of the keeper, who had laid them down, was occupied in conversation with his wife, and locked them both in his cell. He then proceeded to the outer gate, and made his escape. The Dutch magistrates were deeply mortified at the ministers thus escaping through the arts of their good wives, and would fain have punished the latter by detaining them in the place of their husbands, but shame prevented them from doing it.

Paris, sent for a copy of it, that he might examine it more carefully, after which he declared to the directors, "that the more he read it, the better he liked it," and he especially wrote to Episcopius, after the Latin edition was published, saying, "I hope the Confession will do us service with reasonable people; indeed, I find already many persons who are especially well satisfied with it, for which reason I wish you to send me several copies, that I may distribute them to such as I think worthy of them." In France, England, Denmark, and Germany, it was bought with avidity; and in the space of one month, two thousand eight hundred copies of it were sold, the profits of which amounted to one thousand seven hundred guilders.* Independently of this extensive sale making known the sentiments of the Remonstrants, and contradicting the slanders of their enemies, who charged them with entertaining the foulest heresies, the proceeds were extremely acceptable to men who had nothing to depend upon but the benefactions of their suffering people, who, in contributing to their support, did it under liabilities to heavy fines and imprisonment.

The design of the Remonstrants in publishing this work was known some time before its appearance, and it was anxiously looked for by two classes of persons—those who advised and adopted persecution against them, and others who witnessed and sympathized with them under it. The former had to make out a case in justification of their conduct, and for this purpose publicly and daily asserted that they were foul heretics. When the Confession appeared, the rage of many of these persons knew no bounds; for, instead of its being what they had hoped, full of heresies and blasphemies, they were forced to admit that "it contained sound and orthodox doctrines on the subject of the Trinity;" and even the Calvinistic professors of Leyden, who wrote against it, declared that, "with respect to the Divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit, the sentiments it contained perfectly agreed with the analogy of faith;" while others who had wickedly and unjustly, because without evidence, charged them with leaning to the opinions of Socinus on these important subjects, were covered with shame and confusion.

---

* In the year following, Grotius contributed to the funds of the Remonstrant clergy, by giving them the profits of his *Apology*, which amounted to five hundred guilders. This work "is one of the most eloquent and unanswerable productions of its kind." It is divided into twenty chapters, and contains a vindication of himself, his brother magistrates, and the Remonstrants in general, with a refutation of the calumnies raised against them, and proves the injustice of the proceedings instituted against himself and Barneveldt. When first read by Prince Maurice, it greatly agitated him, and undoubtedly contributed to produce that mental anguish which operated to bring down "a robust and indefatigable man into a feeble, languishing state," which speedily terminated in death. This work contains the following testimony in favour of the Arminian ministers: "That he had been very well acquainted with several of the Remonstrant clergy, who, as well as he, were forced to quit their country for the sake of their religion, or else to practise it in great privacy, at the peril of perpetual imprisonment, and that he had found them to be men of piety and learning, and well affected to their governors."—*Brandt, Nichols, Grattan, and De Burigny's Life of Grotius.*

To the friends of the Remonstrants it was highly satisfactory, and they spoke of it in the strongest terms of approval. In various parts of Europe testimonies in favour of it were published by the most eminent divines and professors, especially those of the Lutheran Church. All this was deeply mortifying to the High Calvinistic party in Holland, many of whom, though they could not denounce it as heretical, yet, as in the case of the Leyden professors, they attempted to destroy its effects in favour of the Remonstrants, by basely insinuating, as Festus Hommius had done before of Episcopius, that "though the public declarations of the Remonstrants were orthodox, yet the thoughts they entertained were directly the opposite." It was this iniquitous proceeding that gave severity to Episcopius' pen, when attacking the conduct of such men, who dared to usurp the place of the Divinity, in professing to understand the undeclared thoughts of individuals, and pronounce them as being heretical. In allusion to the conduct of these gentleman, Bayle archly says, "It was absolutely necessary they should charge the Remonstrants with being guilty of gross errors; and because the world began to say that the five famous points were not sufficient reason for persecuting this people, they must therefore assert that, when they found nothing in the Confession that could be branded as grossly heretical, they should declare that though they used the language of orthodoxy, yet they concealed the poison of heresy in their hearts." On the iniquity of these proceedings we need offer no comment, only would add that on such unjustifiable grounds they did not scruple to persecute the Remonstrants as heretics.

There is one circumstance in the conduct of these Arminian clergymen, relative to this Confession, which we must notice, because it has been adverted to in the way of disapproval by some persons who had no quarrel with them on the points of doctrine it contains; that is, the fact of its not being made binding upon the members of their community by oaths and subscriptions. Hence the following declaration—certainly designed to be understood as a censure—"No person, not even a pastor, was obliged by any form to adhere strictly to it, but every one was left entirely at liberty to interpret its language in the manner that was most agreeable to his private sentiments."* We have already said that we are not surprised that these men, suffering under the violent attempts of the Calvinists to make them subscribe articles at which their consciences revolted, should hesitate, under such circumstances, to adopt measures which might subsequently render others liable to sufferings which they themselves were then enduring. And it should be understood that between the act of subscribing, or swearing, and that of giving in either a written or *vivâ voce* approval of the Confession, which was done by all these ministers, there was no middle path. And when the reader is reminded that these men, in openly declaring their approval of sentiments, for the maintenance of which they had previously suffered the loss of office in the national Church, were many of them, at the time they made it, in dungeons and prisons, or wandering from place to place under the cover of darkness, to communicate spiritual instruction to their flocks, in doing which they were constantly liable to be taken, and made subject to perpetual imprisonment; we ask him, Can their sincerity be doubted, or was it necessary to test it, while these heroic and faithful pastors were thus labouring to inculcate the doctrines this Confession contained, amid perils, poverty, and persecution? And peremptorily to have insisted upon an oath, to prove the reality of their attachment to it under such circumstances, would, we think, have been little less than insult and a mockery of their sufferings. And yet the fact of their not imposing subscriptions on each other as the test of fidelity in their declarations, has been, to say the least of it, unguardedly attributed to something like laxity of principle and feeling in them, on the high and orthodox statements contained in their Confession. This implied censure is attempted to be vindicated on the alleged ground that some of the succeeding pastors did not evince the same regard for orthodox principles as did the original framers and approvers of it; while an intimation is also given that this would have been prevented, if admission into their communion had been guarded by oaths and subscription to the Confession.*

---

* It has been again and again stated, in the form of a charge against the authors of this Confession, "that it is expressed chiefly in the words and phrases of Scripture," and asserted that "every one was of course left at liberty to annex his own meaning to them."* How far this is correct the reader will judge for himself, if he will examine our translation of it appended to these memoirs, in which every word and phrase of Scripture contained therein is marked in italics. But suppose the statement to be true, still we should concur with the Rev. Tobias Conyers, who, in 1657, said "that orthodoxy would be better proved by a subscription to a known confession of faith, drawn up in Scripture terms and phrases, according to which the preachers of the Gospel might and ought to frame their judgments and doctrines, than by the resolves of some particular men."—See *Nichols' Arminianism*, p. 14.

* See Edinburgh Cyclopædia, as quoted by Watson in his Biblical and Theological Dictionary; article, Arminianism.

---

* The extended circulation of this Confession is adverted to, even at the present day, by the Remonstrants in Holland with great pleasure, while their attachment to the sentiments it contains, and the interest that is felt by some of them in the anticipation of a wider spread of the doctrines it embodies, may be seen from the following circumstance. The writer, wishing to collate his translation of it from the Latin edition with the one published in Dutch, was enabled to obtain a copy of it in the latter language from an Arminian clergyman, through the medium of Thomas Walker, Esq., of Stockton-on-Tees, only on the following condition, that a copy of the English translation, when published, should be forwarded to him in Holland. This minister, in giving up the only copy of this work that he had in his library, sent with it a beautifully written note, expressive of his satisfaction at the extensive sale the work had had, with a high encomium upon the sentiments it contained, and his pleasure at the prospect of its appearing in an English dress. We

The utility of a confession as documentary evidence of a Church being the depository of orthodox sentiments, we of course fully admit; but that the possession of such an instrument is absolutely necessary to secure the orthodoxy of any religious community, or that subscriptions to it invariably serve as a safeguard against the admission of heterodox ministers into its bosom, is proved not to be the case by the undisputed testimony of facts. If we look to the Protestant Churches of the continent, they had their confessions and subscriptions, yet the history of those of Geneva, France, Germany, &c., during the last century, shows the strange anomaly of such Churches having a written orthodox creed, while their ministers, subscribing such an instrument, were publicly avowing and preaching doctrines, not merely heterodox, but scarcely one remove from semi-infidelity. Such a state of things can be accounted for on the avowed conduct of a celebrated English divine, who, though heterodox in sentiment, signed the orthodox articles of his Church, not as articles of faith, but as articles of peace and unity. And thus it is seen, that whatever value confessions and subscriptions may have, yet it is possible for them to be awfully injurious, in being made instrumental in fostering deception and fraud in matters where such vices assume the darkest forms, or being regarded only as the means of keeping up the semblance and rites of Christianity, and binding the members of a Church under one form of ecclesiastical government, while those principles instinct with holy life, generating faith, piety, and devotedness to God, which form the great bond of spiritual union among saints, are lost sight of by those who become the nominal members of a Church by merely assenting to the documentary testimony of truth, as found in its acknowledged confession.

In proof that the principles of orthodoxy may be maintained unimpaired in a religious community without a written declaration of faith, take the case of the Wesleyan body,* which, from its numbers, unity, and the spread of

---

have thought it right to make this statement to show the estimation in which it is held by a successor of those ministers who originally drew it up or approved of it.

* It is true, the Wesleyan ministers are examined on the points of orthodoxy both before and after their admission into the office of

its doctrines into the four quarters of the globe, must be denominated a Church, and which has existed nearly one hundred years, retaining the orthodoxy of its venerable founder, without any such confession.* That Churches are awfully liable to deteriorate and depart from those orthodox principles with which they were primitively distinguished, we admit; but a regard to something more than written confessions, oaths, and subscriptions, is necessary to keep them pure. There must be anxiety for the maintenance of those vital principles of union which, though quite eluding research, if submitted to analysis, yet forming those moral ligaments which unite the spiritual body of Christ, enable the subjects of them to recognize each other, "just as the *living* recognize the *living*; while no artificial process can avail to enable the dead to exercise such a discriminative office." "Let but a community," says a modern writer, with whose sentiments we concur, "whether more or less extended in its sphere, be pure in manners; let the Scriptures be universally and devoutly read by its private members, and honestly expounded by its teachers; and in this case it will be very little annoyed by the intrusion of heretical or licentious candidates. A Church of this order offers nothing which such persons are ambitious to possess; they will stand aloof; tests will be superseded, and the rod of discipline brought out only on the rarest occasions."

---

the ministry; nevertheless, this is not done by articles in the form of *Leges Scriptæ*.

* "A consistory of divines might spend a century in digesting, first, a profession of faith, and then a code of morals and a rule of discipline, such as should stand as a universal law of Church communion. In the meantime a Christian society, fraught with the vital principle of piety, and faithful to itself, and to its trust, far from awaiting impatiently the result of the conference, might rather hail demur after demur, and fervently hope that the sittings of this Sanhedrim of Christendom might be protracted to the consummation of all things. Nothing that is truly important need be foregone until the creed and code should be brought to perfection;—nothing that we need sigh for would be conferred upon us by the boon when at length it should be granted."—*Fanaticism.*

CHAPTER XV.

We shall now follow those ministers who returned into the Netherlands, and very briefly notice the system of persecution that was adopted against them, their brethren, and their flocks, by the Contra-Remonstrant clergy and magistrates. The reader should understand that, immediately after the departure of the foreign divines from Dort, the provincial members of the synod proceeded, with closed doors, to prepare those measures which should carry out their designs of ejecting the Arminian ministers from their Churches throughout the whole of the Netherlands, and devise plans for the guidance of the magistrates who were to act as their instruments in effecting their purposes. As is customary, according to Baxter, in Presbyterian governments, the ministers of the Dutch Church claimed a kind of secular power, not using it themselves, but binding the civil authorities to imprison men, or confiscate their property, when they had excommunicated them;* and in this way strove to rid themselves of the responsibility and guilt of the punishment thus inflicted upon persons whom they had denounced as heretics. Hence Calvin, in denying that he was the cause of Servetus' death, says, "*I only advised* our magistrates, as having a right to restrain heretics by the sword, to seize upon and try that arch heretic; but after he was condemned, *I said not one word about his execution*."† On such conduct we shall offer no comment, but judge it proper to record the sentiments of a modern writer, who, when speaking of such a species of ecclesiastical authority and finesse, says, "And then the abominable hypocrisy of not itself touching the sword of justice, (alack, the cleanness of its hands!) but of setting the civil power at work when blood is to be shed, can never fail to render its executions so much the more cruel and severe. To be tried and condemned by one authority, and punished by another, is a hard fate, and can differ very little from that of becoming the victim of blind fury." How truly the latter part of this statement is borne out by what the Remonstrant clergy and their people suffered, the details we shall present, though very few, compared with what might be given out of a vast mass of facts, will painfully prove.

---

* See page 77 of this work.

† If he said not one word about his execution after he was condemned, he had said enough before, to show what he could, and what he would do to procure it. "For he wrote to Farel, (and his own handwriting is still extant in Paris,) saying *that if his authority was of any avail, he would prevent Servetus from returning alive*. And he kept his word."—*Nichols' Arminianism and Calvinism compared*, part i, p. 271.

In noticing some of the deeds of ecclesiastical bigotry which were executed at this period in the Netherlands, by men who were rigidly attached to the creed of Calvin, and too fearfully imitated his persecuting measures, we do not intend to intimate that it is a necessary consequence of persons receiving the doctrines which he advanced, that they must necessarily imbibe the persecuting spirit with which he was distinguished. A better temper marks the present age, and none are more opposed to such conduct than most of those who assume the name of this celebrated doctor. But while the writer bears this testimony to the moderate and catholic spirit of many of those who are now considered the followers of the Geneva reformer, still it will be no departure in him from the liberality of the present age to relate acts of illiberality by persons in the Dutch provinces, who were designated by Calvin's name at the period of which he is writing. Never did any portion of the Protestant Church, since the time that the cruel and tyrannical power of popery was disavowed, imbibe so much of the ruthless and bigoted spirit of persecution, as did the Dutch Calvinistic divines against their brother ministers and fellow Christians, who had adopted the doctrines of Arminius. In support of this statement, we beg leave to present the reader with the following extract from a publication issued after the closing of the Synod of Dort, by the theological faculty of Wurtemberg, in Saxony, under the title of *A Faithful Warning to all the Lutheran Christians in Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and other Countries;* in which they say, when speaking of the synod, "The Calvinists have condemned the Arminians upon the article of election, and in so doing have condemned us, inasmuch as the latter defended our sentiments on that point;[*] and they have banished their most eminent ministers from their country for ever. They would treat the Lutherans, if within their power, in the same way, charging them with being Pelagians and heretics. For with them it is a principle that heretics ought to be rooted out by force, as Calvin, Beza, and several others of their leaders have maintained, and thereby shown themselves to be advocates for the execution of bloody decrees."[†] When we know that many of these Dutch divines made high-sounding professions of piety as the ministers of the meek and holy Founder of our religion, and yet associated with it so much rancorous and malignant passion, one can but sigh over the weakness of human nature.

Their first measures went to prepare the way for the expulsion of those professors from their office in the university of Leyden, who were in the least suspected of leaning to Arminianism. And in doing this, they caused the ban of their deprivation to fall upon some of the most dsitinguished scholars of the age. Among these were Gerard Vossius, regent of the theological college, "a person pre-eminent for his learning, discretion, and virtues; being well skilled in polite literature, history, and sacred and profane antiquities;" Caspar Barlæus, vice-regent of the same college, a distinguished scholar and poet; Peter Bertius, professor of ethics; William Coddæus, professor of Hebrew; Gilbert Jacchæus, professor of philosophy; John Meursius, professor of Greek; Cornelius Sylvius, professor of jurisprudence. The ejecting these men from their offices, or otherwise degrading them, by the Contra-Remonstrant party, does not much surprise us; and had they stopped there, no very great complaints had been uttered against them. They had long sighed for the distinction these offices conferred, and it must have been deeply mortifying to them, to have seen them held by the Arminians; and now that they had got the ascendancy, it was natural for them to enter into the possession of the good things hitherto principally enjoyed by their opponents. It is only just for us to say that we think that neither Calvinistic nor Arminian virtue could rise so high as to enable its subject to leave in office a defeated antagonist, when accessible by the victor. As to the dishonourable and cruel means adopted by the Contra-Remonstrants to gain the ascendancy, that is another matter. Festus Hommius, who had long wished for the distinction attached to a professorship, and had viewed with deep mortification the elevation of Episcopius to that dignity, now saw himself robed in a professor's gown, a reward bestowed upon him for all his double dealing and hostility to the Remonstrants.*

---

[*] Melancthon, one of the restorers of ancient learning, like Zuinglius, rejected the stern dogma of absolute predestination, in which he has been followed by the Lutheran body, leaving it to become, in after ages, the distinction of the followers of Calvin, and still more of his successor, Beza.—*Sir J. Mackintosh's History of England*, vol. ii, p. 143.

[†] "The popish authority claimed by the Calvinists was indeed more odious and more unreasonable, because more self-contradictory, than that which the ancient Church inherited through a long line of ages: and they now punished with death those dissenters who had only followed the examples of the most renowned of Protestant reformers, by a rebellion against authority for the sake of maintaining the paramount sovereignty of reason."—*Sir J. Mackintosh's History of England*, vol. ii, p. 132.

The next step was to carry their designs of exclusion into all the provincial classes, requiring the members to subscribe to the canons of the Synod of Dort; and when any refused, they were instantly deprived of their ministry, and the civil authorities immediately followed with a demand that the parties so deprived should sign *The Act of Cessation*, that is, that they should not preach the doctrines of Arminius, on pain of banishment or imprisonment. Our limits will not allow us to detail the iniquitous proceedings instituted against those who refused to sign this document, or detail the sufferings which they were called to endure, although we may subsequently advert to a few of these cases.

---

* The office of divinity professor in this university is the most eminent post of honour to which a Dutch divine can aspire. When he appears in public, he wears a large black silk gown, bordered with velvet, on which the word "Leyden" is worked in silver. Festus, besides being thus elevated, was farther honoured in being appointed to be the bearer of a copy of the acts of the synod to our James, who presented him, it is said, with a gold cup and salver. Heinsius intrigued to be sent on this errand, but Festus manœuvred and supplanted him. James, with that inconsistency peculiar to his character, while he thus rewarded the messenger of the States for bearing these Calvinistic decrees, subsequently published an order prohibiting the clergy, who were under the degree of a bishop or dean, to preach on the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or the irresistibility of God's grace; and then interposed with the States on behalf of a traitorous monk of the Dominican order, who of course advocated these doctrines. It is true, James did this from political motives to please the Spanish court, as he had previously acted when joining in the condemnation of the Remonstrants to gratify Maurice and his minions.—*Brandt, Sir John Carr, Crowe, Lord Nugent.*

Measures were then adopted, on the part of the magistrates, to prevent the people from assembling for the purpose of celebrating public worship. One proclamation followed another, each more severe than the last, imposing fines upon those who dared to meet for such a purpose; while to harbour an Arminian minister, or show him any act of kindness, or suffer him to perform any religious duty in a family, though it were only to pray with a dying person, exposed the head of it to the heaviest fines; and such ministers to imprisonment or banishment. Persons known either to collect or contribute money to the support of the deprived or banished ministers, were visited with the heaviest penalties. Large rewards were given to individuals who detected persons either in allowing public service to be held in their houses, or those who were present at such assemblies, or found in any way by their public conduct to sanction the cause of Arminianism.

One circumstance, connected with these proceedings, shows the estimate in which the Calvinist party held the character and moral principles of those whom they so persecuted. They adopted measures to which we are inclined to believe even the inquisition of Spain itself furnished no parallel; for even there the familiars and judges brought a charge against persons who were arraigned before the *holy tribunal*, but in the case of the still *holier tribunals* of these Calvinistic inquisitorial courts, charges were not advanced against the persons arraigned, but they were made to be their own accusers; and if they refused to convict themselves, they were heavily fined, and, on refusal of payment, instantly sent to prison. The method adopted in such cases was as follows:—A spy would select his victim with the hope of sharing the fine to be imposed; give notice to the magistrates of the person so marked;

when the latter was summoned to appear before them, and without any charge being alleged against him, and, consequently, no evidence produced of the infraction of any of their persecuting statutes, he was required upon oath to say whether he had heard preaching from the Remonstrants, had had a Remonstrant minister in his house, subscribed any thing to their support, or attempted to bring into disrepute the doctrines of the Contra-Remonstrants. Such cruel and unjust proceedings at once prove the confidence these iniquitous religionists had in the sincerity and fidelity of the principles of the party they were persecuting, and stamp their own with the foulest forms of injustice, iniquity, and tyranny.

The reader will at once imagine that such a system of *espionage* would inflict distress upon a vast portion of the unoffending inhabitants of the Dutch provinces, while the spy,* the jailor, and the judge, were the persons most dis-

---

* The reward offered for the discovery of returned banished ministers, induced many to become spies, which led to the adoption of singular measures on the part of the latter to identify them, and the former to elude being detected. A barber, on one occasion, suspecting that a person who called to be shaved and have his hair cut, was a minister, in order that he might identify him, gave him a slight mark on the cheek with his razor, while performing the operation of shaving, and in cutting his hair left a tuft upon his head, and then hastened to the magistrate to give information of him, when the suspected person was immediately seized. But the barber had got upon a wrong scent, his customer being a mason instead of a minister.

The wife of Næranus, an Arminian clergyman, when dying, petitioned the magistrates of the city to allow her husband to come and visit her before her death, which was refused. This occasioned spies to be constantly around her house, and even to get up to the windows to look into the dying woman's room, supposing that if her husband heard of her state, his affection would prompt him at all risks to hasten to her bedside; but he was unacquainted with her condition, and therefore they were disappointed.

Ryckewaert, one of the cited ministers, who was banished, having got to hear that his wife was dying, and that her request for him to be allowed to visit her was not granted, hastened to see her, though he made himself liable to perpetual imprisonment by returning into Holland; and after travelling to the place where she resided, got some friend to put him into a very large basket or wicker hamper, and carry him in open day to her house, where he stayed with her till she died.

In many instances Contra-Remonstrant ministers stooped to the mean act of becoming spies and informers, as may be seen in Brandt, tinguished for the extent of their employment. Many families were completely ruined; fines of a most enormous amount being imposed upon them; their rights as citizens to follow their lawful callings taken away, or themselves expelled from their friends and connections. One case we may just mention out of many others. A venerable man, an inhabitant of Leyden, who was detected in allowing a meeting to be held in his house, and in contributing to the support of the exiled Remonstrant ministers, was summoned before the magistrates, banished the town, and condemned in a fine of one thousand gold reals for suffering this meeting to be held, then in six hundred guilders for collecting money for the ministers, and twenty-five more for refusing to declare the names of those who were present at the meeting. This man, it should be understood, had long been attached to the doctrines of Arminius, and so early as the year 1574, when the town of Leyden was besieged by the Spaniards, he was one of those who on that occasion not only took part with his fellow citizens in that display of courage and endurance of suffering, of which nothing in the annals of modern history furnishes any parallel, but also rendered other essential services in the defence of the city, throughout the whole of the trying period of the siege.* And yet it was such men as these,

---

though we should hope they did not accept the rewards offered for the detection of ministers, as they were the persons concerning whom they were principally desirous of giving information, in order to secure their imprisonment.

* The circumstance of such a person being an object of Dutch Calvinistic bigotry and persecution may warrant us in adverting briefly to this siege.

It commenced on the 26th of May, and ended on the 3d of October. Many weeks before this last period there had not been a morsel of bread within the city, and the only food had been the roots of herbs and weeds, and the flesh of dogs and horses. Even all these were at length consumed, and the people were reduced to live upon soup made of the hides of animals that had been killed. The Spaniards, aware of these circumstances, pressed them to surrender, but they had resolved rather to die of hunger, or perish with their wives and children in the flames of the city kindled by their own hands, than surrender and be murdered by the Spaniards, which certainly would have been the case, had they suffered them to enter the city; and therefore they replied to one of these messengers, "that, rather than submit to so perfidious and cruel an enemy, they would feed on their left arm, and defend themselves with their who had fought for their country's liberty, or the sons of such brave citizens, who were then being persecuted by a race of men, who, to use the words of the old ejected

right."* Nevertheless, it is to be supposed that some, amid anguish and suffering, would be disposed to revolt and submit to their enemies. On one occasion a number of the citizens, impelled by a species of madness produced by hunger, hastened to one of the leading magistrates by the name of Vanderwerf,† exclaiming "that he ought to give them food, or deliver the town into the hands of the besiegers." He replied, "I have solemnly sworn that I will never surrender myself and my fellow citizens to the cruel and perfidious Spaniard, and I will sooner die than violate my oath. I have no food, else I would give it you; but if my death can be of use to you, take, tear me in pieces, and devour me. I shall die with satisfaction, if I know that by my death I shall for one moment relieve you from your dreadful necessity." Astonished by this extraordinary answer, they were silent; their fury abated; and they retired with shame.

Necessity, however, became the occasion of desperate measures. It was determined by the States that the banks, which prevented the sea from inundating their country, should be broken down, and the land laid under water, so as to compel their enemies to retire.‡ "The whole nation," says Bentivoglio, "prayed that the winds might blow the waters in the direction wished for, when lo!" says he, "there rolled in no longer waves, but even high mountains of waters, so that the country around Leyden seemed to be turned into a sea." The Spaniards were forced to retire. Relief was borne to the besieged, which had it been withheld two days longer, they must

---

* The sailors selected to carry in provisions to the Leydeners, when the waters were swollen, were Zealanders, a rude, fierce, bold, and determined people. These men wore a half moon in their caps, with this inscription, *Turks rather than Papists.* We are not astonished at this, when we think of the treachery and wholesale murders committed upon the people by the Spaniards. But we were shocked at reading the following account in Grotius' *Annales des troubles du Pays-bas.* "Un marinier, lequel ayant arrache le cœur d'un Espagnol le deschira a belles dents."

† This gentleman appears to have been a very moderate, prudent man, possessing great influence with the citizens. During this siege the Leydeners invented paper money of two different amounts; the one of fourteen, and the other of twenty-eight stivers' value. On the one was stamped a lion holding a sword and shield, with this motto, *Pugno pro patria.* On the other, a lion holding a hat upon a spear, with the following inscription, *Hæc libertatis ergo.* One of the preachers, in a sermon, furiously attacked the governors, and called them libertines and free-thinkers, for not stamping the following motto upon them, *Hæc religionis ergo.* His reproaches so incensed an officer of the town, who was sitting in the magistrates' pew with Vanderwerf, that he drew out a loaded pistol, and said, "Shall I fetch him down?" but he was dissuaded from it by this gentlemen. It would seem that it was rather dangerous to reprove such hearers!

‡ Communications were kept up with the besieged by pigeons. These were embalmed, and are still preserved in the town house of Leyden.—*Les Delicesdu Pays-bas.*

Senator Hooft, "had hid themselves in the shade in the day of storm and tempest." This fact the Remonstrants knew, and in those towns where they were the most numerous, which was the case in several of them, they felt it extremely difficult to witness the butchery committed upon their fellow worshippers by the soldiery, as directed by the magistracy of Maurice, and influenced by clergymen who had been put in the place of venerable men, whom they had been accustomed to esteem for years; and the efforts of their devoted ministers were constantly directed to prevent them from standing upon the defensive against such measures. And while these ruthless proceedings were of course very trying to the Christian meekness, patience, and courage of men, who had been accustomed to stand in phalanx to resist Spanish despotism and the persecuting spirit of Popery, or had heard their fathers recite deeds of heroism in defence of religious liberty; their piety appears the more evident in submitting to a politico-religious faction of their own countrymen, who, with hired foreign troops at their beck, thus ruled the majority of their fellow citizens. In many of the towns the Remonstrants, besides being the most numerous, were also the most respectable; and when the native soldiery were awed by the character of the men whom they had been accustomed to revere as magistrates, and shrunk from the task of firing indiscriminately on the citizens, one is mortified to know that English and Scotch troops were selected to do this work of butchery, in preference to French papist soldiers, because the latter had shown too much lenity in executing the biddings of the Contra-Remonstrant authorities.

all have perished. After the people had been a little refreshed by partaking of the food brought to them, though many so greedily devoured it that it proved instant destruction to them, they hastened, accompanied by the magistrates, to one of the churches, to render thanks to the Almighty. Never was any assembly more deeply agitated by the consideration of their signal and unexpected deliverance, when they were upon the brink of ruin; joined to the remembrance of the dismal scenes which they had witnessed, and of the many friends and fellow citizens whom the famine or pestilence had carried off, their minds were overpowered at once with gratitude and sorrow. They were dissolved in tears, and mingled together the voices of praise and lamentation.—*Grimestone, Grotius, Bentivoglio, Watson, Grattan.*

Although the Arminians were prohibited holding public worship, nevertheless, unawed by the threatened severities of the proclamations, they held their religious meetings, says one of their writers, throughout the whole of the United Provinces, and especially in Holland. They were held in towns and villages, in houses* and barns, in garrets and cellars, in fields and highways, in streets and gardens. This contumacy, as it was called, was highly offensive to the bigoted Contra-Remonstrant magistrates and clergy; and Maurice, though he did not assume the name of sovereign after Barneveldt's assassination, was as absolute in his dictum as any eastern despot, and, at the request of the magistrates he had created in the place of the Remonstrants, sent troops to enable them to suppress these assemblies. The reader may judge of the strength of the Arminians in Rotterdam, when he is informed that the first time they held a meeting in a field, some few miles from the town, not less than five thousand of them assembled to hear preaching. The Calvinist party were enraged at this, and determined to take vengeance the next Sunday. After keeping the gates of the city closed to a period far beyond the usual hour, to prevent so many of them assembling, two troops of English and Scotch soldiers were led out to disperse about two thousand persons who had met to hear a sermon, on which occasion they fired upon the people. Some were killed, and others received serious, wounds, of which they afterward died. Several gentlemen, with the muzzles of the soldiery pointed at their breasts, were robbed of their purses, the ladies stripped of their jewels and rings, while others were treated in a way not to be named; and what forms the darkest feature in this scene, was the fact of some of the Calvinist clergy viewing it from the top of their churches by the aid of their perspective glasses, and wantonly enjoying these deeds of blood and slaughter.

---

* When the sheriff of any town received information that a meeting of the Remonstrants for worship was to be held, he usually hastened with soldiers to seize upon some of the parties, for the purpose of their being fined, or conducted to prison. The sheriff of Haarlem being engaged in this work one night, entered a house where a meeting was being held. The people took the alarm, and began to escape, when this officer laid hold of a lady in the passage, whom he could not distinguish on account of the darkness. Having seized her hand, he found she was a person of quality by the rings she wore, and insisted upon her telling her name. She remained obstinately silent for some time, till at length he urged her to tell her name in a way that was unpleasant, when she exclaimed, "I am your sister Mary! but did our common mother bring you into the world for this end, that you should persecute the Church and people of God? I am sure our father never taught you to act thus, or to cherish the principles you have imbibed." He was thunder-struck, said not a word, but led her by the hand to the back door, charging the soldiers not to interrupt her.

It is painful to us to record these acts of religious bigotry, but fidelity requires it of us. At a similar meeting held a few days after, some of the military having been perceived approaching the congregation, the people dispersed, some of whom were pursued by the former, several of the latter, throwing their purses to them, to induce them to spare their lives. In one instance, a father and his two sons endeavoured to escape by getting into a boat, when the soldiers levelled their muskets at them. The father entreated them not to fire, promising to tell them where they lived, which they disregarded, and instantly shot one of the sons, a young man of twenty-two years of age, through the head, who fell dead into the water, and the father with difficulty escaped being stabbed by them. The reader must here be informed that the under sheriff was called out of church for the purpose of directing the soldiers in this business, and after its melancholy close he returned, says a historian, with his hands wreaking with blood, to receive the sacrament. Of course no judicial proceedings were instituted against the murderers, it being understood by the magistrates, that the Arminians were as sheep marked for slaughter.

We do not intend to pall the reader with any more recitals of this kind, though alas! it could be too easily done. Can it be matter of surprise, that under such circumstances the Remonstrants became impatient of endurance, the more especially where they were the most numerous party? They said, "The Calvinists themselves have set us the example of resisting the authorities, in the propagation of their system which they call the Reformation. They made use of all kinds of weapons at their meetings to prevent their enemies from falling upon them, and prepared themselves for direct acts of hostility."

To these arguments of their people the Arminian clergy replied "that the weapons of their warfare were not to be carnal; that religious truth was not to be defended or propagated by outward force; that they ought to tread in the paths of the primitive Christians, whose arms were only prayers and tears, and who overcame their adversaries by patience and constancy, blunted their swords, quenched their fires, baffled their edicts, and exhausted their magazines of cruelty by the triumphs of Christian patience and Christian meekness." And yet these ministers are the men whom Mr. Scott, the late rector of Aston Sandford, chooses to insinuate were persons of defective and immoral character; and at the same time lauds up to the sky the piety of the Dutch Calvinistic clergy. But when was it ever known that persecutors were more holy and pious than those whom they persecuted? Never! Yet the blind love of creed that could lead this clergyman to see nothing worthy of praise, if it were not under Calvinistic patronage or name, occasioned him to forget this fact in Church history.

While the Remonstrants were left without any legal redress for these murders committed on their sons and friends, they were, however, determined to show their disapprobation of the conduct of the Calvinistic magistrates in a mournful way, by being present at the interments of some of the slaughtered victims. The civil authorities, aware of their intentions, issued an order prohibiting any persons attending these funerals; but in spite of this, fifteen hundred persons assembled, and formed a lengthened procession, who, with serious countenances, but firm demeanour, intimated that they were not to be hindered in the execution of their purpose. The magistrates took the hint, and thought it right not to excite them by letting the soldiers loose upon them. In other places their numbers awed the Calvinistic authorities on similar occasions. Not less was this true with respect to their religious worship; and it was singular to see in a small town* where the majority of the people were Arminians, but against whom all the churches were shut by the magistrates, at the request of the Contra-Remonstrant clergy, the principal part of the people assemble in the streets, and there standing to receive the sacrament from their own ministers; a practice that was frequently attended to in other places, in the open fields.

---

* The Remonstrants of Kampen were by far the most numerous of the inhabitants. Their three churches being taken from them, their pastors deprived of their office, and forbidden to exercise their religion, the wardens of the companies called together the guilds or companies of the town, and petitioned the higher powers to allow

Toward the latter end of the year, in consequence of the usual rains which fell at that season, the people were prevented from holding their meetings in the fields, but as soon as the frost set in, they took their skates, and in vast numbers flew to some distance, and celebrated Divine worship on the ice uninterrupted, for no civil officer or soldier could overtake any number of persons thus provided with the means of escape over a vast extent of country submerged in water, which was frozen over at that period of the year. Here the people joyfully and and undisturbed sung their psalms, and listened with attention to their minister's sermon; after which a certain number of them always accompanied him on their skates to his home. One of these engaged in this service was a favourite with the people, and went by the name of *The Ice Bird.* The magistrates, in order to bring contempt on the labours of these devoted pastors, called their field

them to hold public worship in other places. In this petition they say, "That that which seems hardest of all is, that when they seek to follow the dictates of their consciences in worshipping God out of the public churches, they are betrayed by spies, and disturbed by a military force, as though they were again brought under Spanish domination. And we beseech you to reflect," they add, "whether we have merited this, whose ancestors formerly resisted Spanish tyranny in defence of religious liberty. Allow us only to serve God in peace, if not publicly, at least in private; but, if you will not consent to either, we cannot forbear to hold our religious meetings, though we should be exposed to punishment, yea, even to death; for we must obey God rather than man. *The wardens of the guilds, in the name of all the burghers and inhabitants whom it may concern.*" All was in vain, however, and persecution still rolled on, like a swelling tide, through the various parts of the provinces.

The copy of Brandt, from which the writer takes this, has the following marginal note written in pencil by some person, "No mercy from blood-thirsty Calvinists." This is too strong, but the persecuting cruelty of the Contra-Remonstrants, at this period, was certainly awfully rigorous and unrelenting against the Arminians.

preaching, *Hedge Sermons.* This they did in imitation of the Spaniards, who had previously adopted it against the Reformed from the French Papists, who had so designated those of the Huguenots.* They would, however, find some difficulty in applying the same appellation to those sermons preached by the *Ice Bird* and others, as described above.

In their proclamations the magistrates also designated the Arminian clergy vagabonds and strolling preachers. This was done to bring them into reproach with the people, a practice not unusual with the favoured party, who, reposing under the shield of the government, claim a kind of *jus divinum* of office, and look upon all other ministers, however distinguished by intellect, learning, piety, and zeal, as quacks in divinity, and only meriting scorn. Our own country has afforded examples of such conduct on the part of many toward the Wesleys and their coadjutors in their early labours. With what injustice these epithets were applied to the Remonstrant ministers the names and patrons of the men will prove. Most of them had been inducted into the service of the sanctuary, and taken a leading part in Church affairs, in connection with the counsels of Barneveldt and of Grotius, the latter of whom, for his splendid talents and scholarship, was designated by foreigners the Belgic phœnix. Some of them were among his choicest friends, which proves that they could not be the ignorant and despicable characters which Calvinistic bigotry and persecution would represent them to be. But they were now the oppressed party, and that was sufficient reason for their being so stigmatized.†

---

* See page 19.

† We admit that among the Contra-Remonstrants there were several distinguished men, but certainly, were we to range them beside Uitenbogaerdt, Episcopius, Grevinchovius, Poppius, Grotius, Vossius, Barlæus, the two Hoofts, and several others, the reader, we think, would not hesitate to say with whom the most talent and learning were found. And even should it be admitted that there was with some on their side a superiority of scholarship, yet the following fact will prove that there were others who were not very great admirers of learning, and the fame attached to the memory of those who had been distinguished for it. Several of the Calvinist clergy at Rotterdam strove to oppose the erection of a statue to the memory of Erasmus, calling it an idol; and these ministers

The reader may judge of the hostility of feeling shown to the Remonstrant ministers and to the persons who entertained them when he is informed that, when any of them died, their friends were forced to inter them, either by stealth in their own premises, or else, under the cover of darkness, in the public burying grounds. In one or two instances this was known, and passed, unnoticed, by some of the magistrates as being the near relatives of the deceased, or so far disposed to respect the memory of the men as to risk encountering the displeasure of the more bigoted clergy and citizens and wink at these interments. This was the case with Henricus Niellius, son of the old Carolus Niellius, mentioned in the note at page 295, and brother to Carolus Niellius who was one of the cited Remonstrants. The principal burgomaster of Rotterdam, where he died, was the nephew of his wife, and connived at his thus being secretly buried by the two brothers of the widow. Another was buried in a barn, but the parties were detected, and fined five hundred guilders for harbouring a minister.

We shall close this account of the interments of the proscribed ministers, which might have been more extended, by mentioning the following case, because it forms a relief to the mind in discovering the manifestation of better feeling on the part of the magistrates than in any other instance of a similar kind. The deceased gentleman alluded to was named Henricus Holthenus. He was a man of eminent learning, amiable in his temper, deeply devoted to God, and one of the most zealous and affectionate of pastors. He walked in close communion with God, and his visits and pastoral labours were highly esteemed by his people. Separated from his family, for few of the Remonstrant ministers could have their families with them, he lived pent up in a small garret belonging to one of his flock, rarely enjoying the air, but under the cover of darkness; and ended his life at the age of thirty-eight. His corpse was sent to Elburgh, the place

publicly inveighed, says Brandt, against the image, endeavouring to stir up the people to pull it down, saying that the erection of it was an imitation of a Popish practice which might lead the people to image worship. These gentlemen were worthy predecessors and types of their brethren under our commonwealth.

of his nativity, wrapped up in some cloth as a bale of goods directed to his uncle, a burgomaster, who intended to bury it with the utmost secrecy. His design, however, was discovered. But to the honour of the magistracy and townspeople be it said that, from respect to his virtues and piety, they were determined not to allow him to be buried like a dog. In this they were partly governed by the remembrance of what was due to the memory of the father on account of the services done to the town by him, who had long been the upper sheriff of the court, and, during the Spanish tyranny, was actually marked as one to be hung on account of his patriotic services and the interest he took in the well-being of his fellow citizens, but was so beloved by the people that even his papistical fellow townsmen gave him timely warning, and he happily escaped. When the people learned that the corpse of the pious son of this patriot was thus brought into the town by stealth to be interred, their feelings overcame them, and they felt the unnatural position in which they were placed by the present state of things, in being required to suppress their instinctive attachments to the memory of such a son of such a father; and the magistrates boldly determined to honour his remains, and said, "Let the bell be tolled; we will ourselves attend the funeral:" when the whole of them, with a vast concourse of the people, followed to the grave the corpse of a man, whose father had been the defender of their interests during their conflicts for liberty against Spanish tyranny.

Of the many ministers of the Remonstrants who were seized and shut up in dungeons, we shall only particularly allude to two, namely, Poppius and Niellius. These were directors of their ecclesiastical affairs in the provinces, and their incarceration was painfully felt by all their brethren and their flocks. They had hastened to Haarlem to adjust some matters in the Church there, when information was given of them, and they were seized and led to prison. Poppius was an eminently devoted man. The third day of his imprisonment he spent wholly in fasting and prayer, pleading with God for support that he might be enabled to act as a Christian under the sufferings that he saw he was called to endure. He did the same some little time previous to his examination before the magistrates. Some extracts from a letter sent to his wife, and one to his Church at Gouda, will show the devoted spirit of this learned and amiable minister. Writing to the former, immediately after being conducted to prison, he said,—

"My Dear Wife,—This letter comes upon a sad errand to you and our dear children, as well as to many of our friends. The hour has come in which it has pleased God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to make a prison my habitation; but, my dearest, lift up your eyes toward heaven, and beg the assistance of Divine grace, to the end that you may not faint through too much grief, which might affect your tender and delicate frame. Moderate your sorrow, and be consoled to know that I am prepared to follow the Lord wherever he shall lead me. I have long since devoted my body, my soul, my life, and all I have to Jesus Christ. Though confined in a prison I shall direct my thoughts to, and delight myself with, meditations on the heavenly regions, and my spirit, which cannot be shut up within these narrow walls, shall range at large in that desirable paradise. Am I separated from man? My God, my Saviour Jesus Christ, and holy angels, will keep me company. Am I esteemed by men as a criminal, and numbered with transgressors? Yet the spirit of Jesus will impress on my heart that I am a child of God and an heir of everlasting life, and will constantly refresh me with the living water of Divine grace. Must I now forbear preaching the Gospel? I will employ myself day and night in supplications, holy meditations, and reading the Scriptures; but, alas! my dearest, when I think upon you and our dear children, the certainty I have that you will grieve too much, breaks my very heart. But remember how many faithful servants of Christ have had a similar lot. Confide in the Lord, be resigned, and add not to the pains of my imprisonment by your excessive grief. My dear wife, take care of the children as far as your feeble state of body will permit; bring them up in the fear of God. Still be to them what you have been these several years, both mother and father, and the Lord will assist you. Resign me to God and to Christ, to whom I belong.

From my prison in Haarlem, January 21st, 1623. Your faithful husband, **Edward Poppius.**"

To his Church at Gouda he wrote,—

"Dearly Beloved Brothers and Sisters,—The hour has come against which I prepared myself from the beginning. My body is shut up in a prison, but my soul finds free access to the heaven of heavens by prayer. I am debarred all access to man, and communion with my fellow Christians, but the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, cannot be kept at a distance from me. I, who am a prisoner for Christ's sake, beseech you by the bowels of Christ that you do not faint in the work of God on account of my bonds, but increase in zeal and fervent love. Show for my comfort that my imprisonment may contribute to the spread of the Gospel, that the labourers in Christ's vineyard may preach more courageously. Watch, and be steadfast in the faith; behave yourselves like men, be strong; if ye continue in the Lord, I shall live and be comforted in my sufferings. Encourage yourselves with the words of Malachi iii, 16, 17, 18, Your imprisoned brother salutes you heartily. **Edward Poppius.**"

The two prisoners were examined separately. Poppius was charged with opposing the Reformed religion which was professed at the Synod of Dort. To which he replied "that the doctrine which was established by that synod was never owned before to be the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, but that the Reformed religion was always judged of by '*The Harmony of the Confessions,*' published in the year 1581, in which were found those of Augsburgh, Saxony, and Bohemia, which comprehended the sentiments of the Remonstrants. And in proof," he said, "that the Remonstrant doctrines were considered as being in accordance with those of the Reformed Church so early as 1586, their brother minister, John Bors, now seventy-one years of age, was identified as a pastor of the Reformed Church at that period, though now banished for holding the doctrines he then did, and for which he [Poppius] was made a prisoner." He farther remarked, "The synodists themselves admitted that the doctrines they established were not in the Netherlands' Confession, otherwise they need only have confirmed it as containing them by their public acts, instead of which they made canons to establish their own private opinions." To this there was no reply, and Poppius was forbidden to argue with them. On his refusing to answer certain questions that might involve himself and his Church, a broad intimation was given that the torture of the rack might force a confession, to which he replied: "As to the use of the rack, I shall leave it with you, gentlemen, to do as you please, and must assert that that which you charge me with as a crime, I believe it to be my duty to perform as a minister of the living God."

Niellius was subsequently examined. This man, if the axe of the executioner had been over his head, would have boldly said what he thought it right to say. Martin Luther himself did not exceed him in courage. He was an admirable scholar, very eloquent, and withal a man of incorruptible integrity. When brought before the magistrates to be examined, well knowing him, they wished to awe him by intimating that they acted under the direction of the supreme government, and, therefore, commanded him to tell them the persons who officiated as deacons among them, and distributed the collections made for their support. To which he replied in the language of Cyprian, when the magistrates of the city of Carthage asked him where the elders of the Church were, "You have rightly and wisely established by your laws that there should be no *informers*; consequently, it is not lawful for me to betray them; you may seek them yourselves, especially since you are of opinion that no man should be his own accuser." When it was farther stated to him that he ought to submit to the rulers, and not preach doctrines which they condemned, he replied in the language of Justin Martyr to the emperor, Antoninus, "Those princes or magistrates who prefer their δοξην, *opinion* or *honour* to truth, have just the same authority as robbers in a desert;" that is, they act not by justice, but by force.

These two men were subsequently charged with being privy to the plot against the life of Maurice,* and threatened with the rack, and preparations made to torture them, on which occasion Niellius, conscious of his innocence, said, in writing to a friend, "he hoped to undergo the pain with patience through the gracious assistance of God, but he durst not say whether he should be able to bring his resolution to bear up under it, because he did

---

* The intended assassination of Prince Maurice here alluded to, originated with Lord Van Stoutenburg, the youngest son of Barneveldt, who sought to revenge the death of his father upon Prince Maurice. He unfortunately induced a discarded Remonstrant

minister by the name of Slatius to join in the plot. This man, after being detected, had an intimation given to him that he would be pardoned, if he discovered his accomplices. Under the delusive hope excited by this promise, he charged the whole body of the Remonstrants as being implicated in the intended act. This the Calvinist ministers took hold of, and denounced them from the pulpit. This wretched man, however, when he found he was to have no pardon, revoked all he said, and declared that it was false, stating, in a written document, that he had made such a charge under the hope of pardon. The affair deeply distressed the Remonstrants, and especially Episcopius, "who deplored the fact," he said, "that they had ever had such characters among them." Stoutenburg made his escape; afterward joined the Spaniards; obtained the captaincy of a regiment, and used to make incursions into his native country, carrying before him a black flag, with the effigy of a death's head, to announce the mournful vengeance he came to execute. The older son, Groeneveld, who was privy to the conspiracy, was detected, and, prior to his execution, his mother, the widow of Barneveldt, appeared in the presence of Maurice, with her son's wife, to ask the life of her son. "If ever mercy was becoming," says a modern writer, "to a man, it would have been pre-eminently so to Maurice on this occasion; but he was inflexible as adamant. The mother, the wife, and the son, threw themselves at his feet, imploring pardon for Groeneveld. Prayers, tears, and sobs were alike ineffectual. It was on this occasion that Maurice asked the mother 'why she begged mercy for her son, having refused to do as much for her husband?' to which cruel question she made the sublime answer, 'Because my son is guilty, and my husband was not.'"

At the last interview this gentleman had with his wife, being overwhelmed with distress, he said to her, "What a sorrowful widow you will be!" when this lady, who seems to have been an affectionate, amiable woman, but who had singular notions of what was essential to the dignity of a patrician, replied, "My dearest, in return of all my troubles, do me the honour of dying like a gentleman." The expression of this lady, it appears, found its way to Maurice, who so far as regarded himself met her wishes, as to allow her husband to go to the place of execution without being pinioned, and wearing his sword. He died with great courage, almost universally regretted, from the consideration of his being remarkably amiable, and not having been actively engaged in the conspiracy, though he was privy to it, but did not make it known, for which he suffered.—*Brandt, Grattan, Bayle, Grimestone.*

not know what it was to be put to the rack. Certainly," he said, "he dreaded the torture more than death, but he hoped the best from God's mercy and fatherly assistance."* Poppius, it is said, was stripped to be put on the rack. He was deeply affected, and asked leave to pray before being put to torture. It was granted, when he prayed with great devotion and fervency to God for assistance to enable him to endure what he was about to undergo. This, it appears, powerfully affected the magistrates. He was afterward led away, and both of them were kept in suspense for some hours, a contention taking place among the authorities upon the subject of putting their threat into execution. Two counsellors, with the scout, opposed it, and it was finally announced to them that they were believed to be guiltless as to the conspiracy, and that farther proceedings against them would be dropped in relation to it. This information of course overwhelmed them with joy, and each threw himself upon his knees, and thanked God that he had delivered them from being tormented, and saved their judges from committing so cruel an act, and that they had the testimony of the magistrates themselves that they were fully satisfied of their innocence. Nevertheless, Triglandius, a violent Contra-Remonstrant minister, and a mendacious and abusive writer against the Remonstrants, did not scruple to assert in print that there were sufficient proofs against them to warrant their being put to the rack. This man would have made a fine inquisitor general. It was finally proposed that, for returning from banishment and holding Remonstrant meetings, they should be sentenced to death or perpetual imprisonment.* The latter was at length agreed upon, and they were accordingly condemned to be conveyed to the castle of the Louvestein, there to be kept during their natural life. The prisoners consoled themselves under this sentence, in knowing that the magistrates admitted that they were satisfied they were not accessory or privy to the plot against the life of Maurice. Hence it followed they were condemned merely on account of their preaching the doctrines of Arminius, and, therefore, were sufferers for what they deemed to be the truth. In this affair the Calvinistic clergy were awfully involved, as appears from ample evidence.

---

* The accuracy of confessions extorted by the rack, must always be considered questionable; for as the sufferer usually knew what was required from him, it was natural that, in the moment of agony, and under the hope of release, he should declare that which was wished by his tormenters, while the measure itself was fraught with danger, as opening the way for involving persons who were perfectly innocent. Never was this so fully seen as in the case of Poltrott, a Huguenot gentleman, who shot the duke of Guise. When put to the rack in order to make him confess his accomplices, he charged Beza with having instigated him to commit the crime, though the latter declared he never spoke to, or saw Poltrott in his life. Felton, who assassinated the duke of Buckingham, after being frequently charged with having accomplices, and it being as repeatedly denied by him, was told by the marquis of Dorset that he was directed to inform him that the king intended to employ the rack to make him declare his accomplices. Felton replied "that he was very sorry that such was his majesty's intention, for in that case he knew not what he might say in the extremity of his pain, but certainly the first person he should implicate would be his lordship." This settled the business of the intended torture, for it was never applied.—*Brandt.* See *Life of Hampden, by Lord Nugent.*

On the 15th of May, 1623, they were borne away to the Louvestein. The fiscal who conducted them behaved with great civility and kindness, even allowing them to walk unfettered occasionally, that they might stretch their limbs, on their giving him their word that they would not attempt to escape. He knew they were holy, good men, and could depend upon their promise.

---

* The first of the banished ministers who was sentenced to imprisonment for life, on account of his returning into the Netherlands, was Vesekius, one of the cited clergymen. The conduct of his persecuting opponents toward him was vile in the extreme. They treated him as one of the foulest felons. The directors, Uitenbogaerdt, Episcopius, and Grevinchovius, sent him a consolatory letter, which closes thus: "Be therefore courageous, thou faithful soldier of the Lord of life. The cause for which you suffer is the cause of Divine truth, the cause of Christ, the cause of God himself, the most noble of all causes in the world. Consider duly the opinions maintained by those who furiously persecute us, and weigh in your mind the doctrines which you have professed, taught, and defended, in opposition to them, and which you are still ready to defend. Then will it appear that you fight for the glory of the Divine mercy to miserable mortals, for maintaining the doctrine of the universality of the merits of Jesus Christ,—the sincerity of God, when he calls men to faith, conversion, and salvation,—the power and majesty of his word,—the righteousness of his judgment,—and the necessity of persevering in holiness."

Niellius, breathing the air on a fine May morning, for the first time after a long confinement, began to sing a psalm, which greatly surprised Poppius, who said, "What, my brother, so you have yet courage enough to sing?" "Why should I not sing," said the other, "on such a charming day as this, breathing the fresh air as I do after so many months' confinement, and hearing the birds warble so sweetly? I must praise God," said he, "in hymns and spiritual songs."

Among those persons who were called to suffer at this time was the brother of Episcopius, whom we have previously mentioned as having had his house plundered. He was suspected of having made collections among the Arminians in behalf of the exiled ministers, and he was, therefore, summoned to appear before the magistrates; but his lady, who was a courageous woman, persuaded him not to go, and went herself to the Stadt house, where she was asked why her husband did not appear. "Gentlemen," said she, "it is through my entreaties and persuasions that he does not appear before you; for, apprehending that he might be committed to prison, and not having yet recovered from the injury I sustained in my health from the plundering of our house, I am not prepared to meet a second shock in the incarceration of my husband; and I appeal to you, as gentlemen, in this instance to yield to the feelings of a woman and a wife, to promise me that he shall not be committed to prison; but if you will not concede this, whatever may be the consequence of my persisting in preventing his coming before you, I myself am prepared to endure it, though it were the loss of all our property, and I were even to go to death itself." But no promise could she extort from the magistrates that her husband should not be confined; and they began angrily to charge the Arminians with violating the orders contained in the proclamations, when she replied, "If you wish your proclamations to be obeyed, you ought not to issue any that are in direct opposition to the commands of Christ. We ought to obey him rather than man." "Will you not, then, desist holding your meetings," it was said, "although they are prohibited by the government?" She replied, "The apostles were also forbidden to preach, but they did not forbear on that account. The Papists forbade the Protestants likewise, and burned many who did not attend to their proclamations, and yet the Protestants did not cease preaching. The commands of God must be obeyed before those of men."

Some of the magistrates were very furious against Bisschop, and declared that he ought to be quartered, and his limbs placed on the gates of the city as a warning to others. The sequel was, he was forced to escape. But before departing, he wrote an exculpatory letter to a gentleman by the name of Boom, one of the senators of Amsterdam, and his particular friend, in which he assigned a reason for not answering the summons of the magistrates. We shall not give the whole of its contents, but translate the following passages: "As to the subject of religion, in which I confess I feel myself deeply interested, I have diligently investigated its principles, and am persuaded that the opinions I have adopted are not the result of blind attachment to creed, and I should never be afraid to appear before either magistrates, ministers, or elders, to give an account of them under suitable circumstances. As to the fact of my having shown love and charity to my oppressed and persecuted brethren, I beg leave to say that it is true; and that my being threatened with either the rack or the gallows shall not prevent me from administering to the wants of a suffering friend or minister. And while I declare that in so doing I have no other object in view than that of preventing pious and holy men from perishing, who have been expelled from their country on account of maintaining an unstained conscience; I have also a full persuasion that in the last day, when I shall appear before the Son of God, my righteous judge, I shall be justified on account of this act, though now condemned for it by the inquisitorial proclamations of men." He then hastened to Antwerp, where he was some time after followed by his wife and children. Before her departure, however, two of the aldermen entered the house, and made a search among his papers, supposing that they could discover certain documents containing matters to be made the subject of charge against him. Upon one chest, which they were unable to open, they set the city seal, and, after twelve days, again returned and opened it; but, finding it nearly empty, they charged her with having opened it, though the seal was unbroken. This she denied, saying "she had no knowledge of its having been touched by any person." "Then," said they, "it has been opened without your knowledge." "If so, gentlemen," she replied, "I cannot be expected to give any account of it." A report was soon spread abroad that she had broken the city seal, was arrested on account of it, and was to be sent to prison, and branded with a hot iron. The moment this lady heard this rumour she dressed to appear in public, and walked up and down the city for some time, and by this means prevented it from being spread any farther. Limborch, who was the grandson of this lady, evidently took pleasure in recounting the courageous acts of this heroine,* and has given a very lengthened account of the privations she and her husband endured on account of their attachment to Arminianism.

The following year Bisschop, hearing that there was a change in the magistracy of Amsterdam, and that many of those recently elected were his friends, he ventured to return to that city, and was kindly received by them, and shielded from the persecuting bigotry of his opponents. For, when some of the latter appeared against him, inquiring why he was not treated with severity, it was asked in reply, by one of the aldermen, "whether they ought so to treat a reputable man, a virtuous citizen, and an honourable merchant, who had always conducted himself in the most peaceable manner, and who had already suffered so much?" The lenity shown to him by some of the magistrates, especially by his friend the senator, Boom, who was now the president of the court, greatly exasperated the clergy; and they were determined to bring the ecclesiastical arm of power to bear upon him as far as they could. For this purpose they sent the beadle of the Church to summon him before the consistory, but, on his refusing to answer to the citation, certain ministers waited upon him, which was to prepare the way for his being excommunicated. In their several interviews with him they urged him to appear before the consistory, stating that they admitted he knew *the truth in part*, and they were anxious to instruct him yet more fully therein, and in this way show the desire they felt to promote his salvation. Bisschop, who appears to have been an intelligent man, understood what was meant by this arrogant and insulting assumption, that is, that Arminianism included only some few principles of evangelical truth, and he who embraced it was only in an incipient state of acquaintance with Divine subjects; and, consequently, that the higher and more perfect state of information consisted in receiving the dogmas of Calvin and Beza, which *then*, as *since*, by some persons, have been designated *the Gospel*. Bisschop seemed determined to retort this affront, and said, "Gentlemen, do you believe I am capable of acting otherwise than I do?" "I would to God," said one of them, "that you did." The former replied, "But if God willed that I should, could I resist his will?" "I am sorry to hear you talk so," rejoined the other. "That is not an answer to my question," said Bisschop, "and I wait your reply." The minister answered, "Suppose you cannot resist his will, that does not render you guiltless; you could do it in Adam." "I do not ask you, sir, what I could do in Adam, but I ask you to show upon your own principles how you can, with justice, excommunicate me for not doing that which you admit, if not so done, is the result of the Divine appointment." Of course this remark sealed his doom, as he was considered as being blinded and incapable of receiving the *more perfect* information and light of *the Gospel** it was intended to convey to him; and, therefore, the minister, Swalmius, according to Limborch, added, "We can do no more with you; you are as a deaf dog: we shall leave you, therefore, to the Church, to do that which it judges proper to be done."

---

* When Sapma, the minister mentioned in the note at page 351, was arrested, this lady met him being conducted to prison heavily chained. She hurried to the sheriff, and said, "Myn Heer, why do you thus bind a minister, as if he were a thief or a murderer? my very soul is in agony to see it. Loose him, sir, he will not endeavour to escape, and I myself will give bail for him." *Droevige gevangenis en blyde uitkomst van Dominicus Sapma, Bedienaar des H. Evangeliums in de Remonstrantsche gemeente Jesu Christi onder't Kruis; vervat in de vier Brieven.*—Gedrukt, in 4to., 1621.

---

* The bigoted and arrogant assumption of our good Calvinistic friends, in which they were formerly accustomed to claim a superior degree of knowledge and the sole possession of *the Gospel*, is fast declining among the more intelligent and liberal of that body in the present day, and is now broadly put forth only by the hyper-gentlemen of ***The Spiritual Magazine or Saint's Treasury.***

One of the finest rebukes of this arrogant assumption is reported to have been given by the late venerable Earl Fitzwilliam. This gentlemen was applied to by certain persons of this high school for a piece of ground to build a chapel upon, in a village which the writer well knows, "in order," they said, "to introduce *the Gospel* into the place." "Introduce the Gospel?" said the earl, "why, sirs, for my own part, I had always thought that the clergyman, Mr.———, preached the Gospel. And should you not allow that, you must be aware that the followers of Mr. Wesley have a chapel there, and, pray, do you intend to say that they do not preach the Gospel?" Whatever the parties thought, they saw it would not be prudent to reply in the affirmative. The sequel was, they were politely dismissed, without obtaining that for which they had applied. That the conduct of this late venerable nobleman was not the result of opposition to sectaries, but an intended rebuke of bigotry, will be seen from the following statement. Some Wesleyans had previously applied to him for a piece of land in another village, on which to erect a building for the twofold purpose of teaching a school and preaching in it. Having promised to grant them their request, he inquired how the cost of its erection was to be met, when he was informed that the building would be vested in trustees, who made themselves responsible for the expenses. The old gentleman hearing this instantly said, "Then put me down as trustee, and my son also," which was of course done, and his name and that of the present earl are in the trust deed at this day.

The assumption of a more perfect knowledge of *the Gospel*, as identified with an adoption of the opinions of Calvin and Beza, will not of course be given up without some lingering feelings of attachment to such an assumed eminence of attainment, by those who have been accustomod to advance it; and hence the editors of *The Eclectic Review*, in their number for February, 1835, when commenting on the works of the late Alexander Knox, Esq., who seemed to have had very strong Arminian propensities, and put forth Arminian statements, say of him: "His intellectual range was lofty rather than comprehensive, the current of his thoughts ran more deep than clear; he is any thing but superficial, yet there are shallows every now and then in his reasoning." We suppose, if the paradox may be allowed, that these *shallows* appear when he gets into the *deeps* of Calvinism. Still, however, there are great concessions to Arminianism in the above statement. Formerly it would have run thus: His intellectual range was *limited* rather than comprehensive; the current of his thoughts ran more *muddy* than clear; he is very superficial, and shallows *constantly* appear in his reasoning.

Such persons as the writer, who does not know how to reconcile the idea of "a moral administration terminating in eternal rewards

Bisschop, however, was determined before they left him to tell them the principal cause why he could not return to them again, and therefore stated "that it was their cruel, bigoted, and persecuting conduct toward their brethren, the Remonstrant ministers, which prevented him from looking upon them as having that measure of Christianity that could induce him to listen to them as instructers." They replied "that the punishment inflicted upon the Remonstrant ministers was done by the civil authorities, and not by them." "Yes, yes, gentlemen, I understand you," he said, "this was the logic formerly used by the inquisition, which you, it seems, have adopted. Pray, was it not you that incensed the States, and prompted them thus to punish or imprison these pastors, yourselves having first condemned them? And is this the part of the Christian minister? Gentlemen, you have already excluded me, condemned the doctrines I have embraced, and require me to give them up, which I cannot do." Having said this, he was informed "that, because he did not choose to change his sentiments, he, with several others, would shortly be publicly excommunicated." "Pray," said he, "have you selected the present period to do this, in order that we may be marked out and murdered by a furious mob, whom you, by your sermons, have excited against the Remonstrants, intimating that the whole body are implicated with the conspirators against the life of Prince Maurice; which, certainly, is as unjust as it would be to charge the whole Calvinist party with being accessories to the crime of Poltrott, who shot the duke of Guise?" "No," said the other,

---

and punishments," as President Edwards of America did, with his system of "absolute predestination not to be *distinguished* from the philosophical *necessity* of Hartley, Hume, and Priestley," must always be considered by the admirers of this American author, as exhibiting *shallows* in their reasoning, when incapable of uniting such opposites. Rem Bisschop seems to have been one of these *muddy*, *shallow*-headed persons, and was accordingly given up as a deaf dog, and incapable of hearing and receiving the more perfect degrees of knowledge designed to be conveyed to him by the instructions of the Dutch Calvinistic ministers, who thus declared that "though he could not resist the will of God, he was not guiltless on that account, seeing that he could obey that will in Adam."

"we will not excite the people against you, but exhort them to pray for you." "That," said he, "will be fixing a mark upon us, and prompting them to attack us; and allow me to say that, if we are thus to be publicly excommunicated by you, do it, however, in such a manner that you may be able to answer for it before God, and in that way you should wish it to be done to yourselves."

A similar attempt was made upon his brother, Jan Bisschop, but the business was despatched much sooner with him. For the minister, Smoutius, who, says Limborch, was very fiery, dictatorial, and magisterial in his manner, finding that this gentleman demurred at his request that he should appear before the synod, at once turned upon him, and said, "Pray, sir, whom do you take me to be, that you thus dare refuse?" "Why," said the other calmly, "I take you to be that servant, who, it is said, *when his Lord delayed his coming began to beat the men-servants and maidens.*" This fixed his destiny, and that of his good lady, who was the daughter of one of the senators of the city. These, with the secretary of the admiralty, Lawrence Jacobson Real, and some others, making the number of ten, were accordingly publicly excommunicated. A curious incident is stated by Limborch, as taking place soon after it was done, which we shall here relate.

A Dr. Samuel Koster having heard the form of excommunication read, left the Church shortly after; when he was met by a gentleman whom he knew to be a bigoted Calvinist, who accosted him thus: "Well, is there any news?" "News! yes, indeed," said the former, "and of a very serious kind too, and I am glad that I am not a party in the affair." The curiosity of the other was strongly excited, and he exclaimed, "What is it? What is it?" "Why," said the doctor, "I have just come from the new church, where I have heard ten persons of honourable and unblamable character assigned to the devil; and you, Myn Heer, know that the devil is an obstinate, stupid, selfish fool, who always takes care to get what has been consigned to him. And as I apprehend that those who have done it will have some difficulty in fairly handing them over to him, I greatly fear that he will indemnify himself, by taking them in their stead." The other instantly marched off without making any reply.*

When the particulars of the excommunication of these persons reached Episcopius in France, he immediately addressed a long and learned letter to them, in which he vigorously and triumphantly refuted the arguments adduced by the minister in support of this act, as they were stated by him, prior to his reading the form of excommunication; and, therefore, showed it to be a vain and foolish assumption of power. This letter was afterward published without his knowledge, under the title of *Nietigheyt van den Calvinischen ban*; or, *The Invalidity of Calvinistic Excommunication.*

On a review of the conduct of the Calvinist ministers presented in this chapter, who thus excited the civil powers to persecute their fellow Christians and brother ministers, with the methods they adopted to gain and give information against them, in order that they might be committed to a dungeon, and the satisfaction, nay, exultation, they manifested on such occasions, we think the reader will admit with us that it deserves the severest reprobation. This is especially the case in reference to the conduct of Triglandius, who, when dining with some of his friends, and hearing that Welsing, the Arminian clergyman, was brought to the Hague as a prisoner, exultingly and impiously exclaimed at table: "God be praised that this rogue is taken! had I known it an hour sooner, I should have sent information of it to my wife, who would have esteemed it as the most interesting news she ever heard in her life. If none of these fellows [Arminian ministers] have yet worked in the bridewell, I'll take care that this Welsing shall. Come," said he, "fill the glasses, such news is worth rejoicing over." He then drank off a bumper of wine to show his joy at the event, in which he was followed by the rest of the company. In connection with this statement, we deem it right to remind the reader of the fact, that this man took upon himself the office of historian of the ecclesiastical transactions of this period in the Low Countries. This we are afraid he did with the design of giving his own colouring to the affairs of the Remonstrants, and we apprehend that the principal part of the misrepresentations which have been advanced against them in this country, are to be traced to his misstatements.

---

* In several instances the Contra-Remonstrants received severe rebukes on account of their bigotry and rigid opinions. A facetious and satirical man, by the name of Robert Robertson, who did not belong to the Remonstrants, was met one day, while walking on the beach at Horn, by two Calvinist ministers, who, knowing the disposition of the man, were disposed, says Brandt, to joke with him; and they accosted him thus, "Well, Robert, you seem very pensive, what is the matter with you?" "It is true, sirs," said he, "I am pensive, for I was just considering who was the author of sin." "Well," replied the others, "and whom do you consider to be its author?" "Why," said he, "when it was first introduced into our world, *Adam* laid the blame upon *Eve*, *Eve* laid the blame upon the *serpent*, who, at that time, was very young, ignorant, and modest, and bore the charge in silence, but having become more experienced and daring, he has been to the Synod of Dort, and laid the blame upon *God*."

That many of the members of the synod and the Calvinists of the continent, did, in that day, charge God with being the author of sin, the ecclesiastical history of that period furnishes decisive evidence. One instance in proof of the correctness of this statement we shall subsequently notice.

In remarking on the proceedings of these men, we shall advert less to their names than to the principles by which they were governed, in order that we may be enabled to form a correct estimate of their feelings, as the source of that conduct which justly warrants us in designating them complete bigots and finished persecutors. In cases of this kind, a cultivated state of mind seems to form no barrier against individuals acting so foul a part; for many of these were men of learning. This we conceive may arise from the circumstance of the persecutor, while he is engaged in his dark work, being actuated more by the dictate of feeling than of the understanding; and although the latter, viewed in the abstract, might be considered as a guarantee against such measures, yet the fact of a person of educated intellect being a persecutor only goes to prove that if his judgment performs its functions in denouncing such conduct, yet his passions gaining the ascendency shows that the intellect and feelings of the man form two distinct departments, and act as antagonist principles. In most instances we should conceive, that the violent calumniator or persecutor of another acts from self-love and wounded pride, associated with a secret dread that the impugner of his thinkings and opinions may at length overthrow and lay him prostrate in the dust. That facts bear out this statement, as being applicable to the vindictive feelings manifested on the part of the Contra-Remonstrant clergy against their Arminian brethren, appears evident to us. For having shown that they were conscious that they had not the force of argument within their power to silence their opponents,* the transition from a dreaded attempt at reasoning with, to that of denouncing them, was very easy; and as they had the privilege of calling in the aid of the civil authority, to do by the power of the sword what they dare not attempt by the power of argument, they availed themselves of it, and their triumph became complete.

One circumstance we wish the reader to bear in mind, that moral character in its most spotless forms, which, in other cases, comes to the advantage of the alleged culprit, in this instance is found to render his fall more certain and violent while he is under the hand of a priestly persecutor. This originates with the necessity the latter is under to give the colour of justice to the proceedings instituted against his victim, in order to make it appear that the man who is thus to suffer is a malefactor of the darkest shade. And this ghostly malignant finds it to be the most summary mode of accomplishing his purpose to brand him with infamy, by holding him forth as a foul rebel spirit against the truth of God. Having thus wrought himself up to the capability of exhibiting his victim in this light, he is prepared to denounce even holiness of character and acting in him a dangerous feature in his condition, tending to give to the heresy of his opinions a more imposing, extended, and, therefore, destructive influence. Hence we find in the case of one of the Remonstrants who was charged with heterodoxy, in a provincial synod, and a vindication of him being set up by some of its members on the ground of his pious and holy conduct, that a minister said, "Behold, brethren, the pernicious effects of piety!" when he was followed by another, who added "that he was indeed of an unblamable life, but that no heretics could do so much mischief to the Church as those who led good and holy lives, because it enabled them to insinuate themselves more easily into the affections of the people, and in this way they could successfully diffuse their errors." Thus we invariably find that the history of persecution furnishes us with proofs that the most pure, devout, and lofty spirits have been the first selected to gratify the rage of the persecutor and the bigot. Witness the case of Lord Cobham in our own country by the Catholics, and the devout and holy Poppius in Holland by the Calvinists, who finished his days in a dungeon, to satiate their malignity and cruelty. To us it would appear that a person more easily becomes a persecutor when he acts in concert with others than when alone. This arises, we apprehend, from the influence of sympathy he has with the members of a community thus acting, being intent upon the safety of its privileges, while the wickedness of such a deed, or course of deeds, seems to lose much of its guiltiness, as applicable to himself, by its being divided or shared by a larger number of persons. Thus it is that the persecuting measures of a community are more violent and cruel than those of individuals.

---

* See page 294 of this work.

In looking at the case of these Dutch ministers, it may appear a startling circumstance that men who made sounding professions of superior attainments of truth and piety, should be capable of the acts thus attributed to them. But the reader has only to recollect that sacred truths existing in the mind may be neutralized as to their sanctifying effect by being associated with certain pernicious errors. Hence an intolerant person, who is prepared to look upon a man as the reprobate of heaven, and sees in the dogmas that he maintains the very signs of that reprobation, may consider himself called upon to crush the influence of such an individual; and as no method is so effectual to accomplish this as that of destroying him, it seems natural that he should have recourse to it. And if this person is led to suppose that a state of acceptance with the Divine Being is to be found in his admission of certain dogmas, though unaccompanied with any hallowing feeling, such a man, we conceive, is prepared to go the most awful lengths when his opinions are attacked, inasmuch as such a measure tends to throw doubt upon his safety, and he necessarily becomes a fierce and cruel persecutor. Thus, unchecked in his intolerant designs by any thing like the sanctifying power of religion, this defender of mere creed will at once show, in the fury of his zeal, the malevolence of his passions, and the vindictiveness of his feelings, that pity is extirpated from his bosom, conscience is silenced in her court, mercy is banished from his heart, fellow feeling toward his brethren is extinguished, the sacred name of religion is used for the manifestation of the foulest bigotry, and the sense of justice which might exist with this person in other cases assumes the form of barbarous revenge. And when once he has given way to a taste for cruelty, he is prepared for the most ruthless acts, and if he can but see his victim "pale with a paleness which a dungeon sheds on his face; if he can but catch the clanking of a chain about his neck, which a Barabbas yesterday wore; yes, and if he hear him groaning under torments that are the necessary schooling of obdurate wickedness; then he can fill up with ease what was before wanting to tranquillize a just revenge."

In proof that this picture of the persecutor's heart is no caricature, let the reader take the statement of a Calvinistic counsellor, who said, "I wish I were to sit in judgment upon Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius, who, while sending Arminian ministers into Holland to preach, keep our of the way themselves. I would certainly condemn them to be hanged, and take care myself to see the sentence put into execution." We shall close these remarks on the conduct of the Dutch Calvinists of the early part of the seventeenth century, in the language of a writer to whom we have more than once referred in these pages. "If Churches and communities, as well as individuals, have a future retribution to fear—if a day is to come when the righteous Administrator of human affairs and the Head of the Church is to make manifest his detestation of ecclesiastical bloodshed and torments, shall the Church of Rome stand alone at the bar, or have no companion in punishment? Ought we not to think more worthily of the justice of Heaven than to suppose it?"*

---

* Fanaticism.

CHAPTER XVI.

The prominent part which Episcopius took at the Synod of Dort, spread his fame as a theologian and scholar beyond the Netherlands, and his residence at Antwerp attracted the attention of many distinguished and learned individuals. Among these were some members of the Romish community, who paid him very great respect. It was supposed by these that the usage which the Remonstrant clergy had met with from the bigotry of the Calvinist ministers of their own country, would dispose them to listen to insinuating invitations to enter the Catholic Church. Indirect attempts were, therefore, made upon them for this purpose at Antwerp, and afterward in France, when these banished ministers had taken up their residence in that country, after the termination of the truce between the Spaniards and the Dutch. In the latter instance the French Catholics calculated upon success, grounded upon the refusal of the Reformed of that kingdom to allow Grotius to enter their communion, unless he first promised to abandon Arminianism. But though the Remonstrants had been persecuted and expelled from their country by the Calvinistic clergy of the Netherlands, and not suffered to hold communion with those of France, yet having adopted their opinions as the fruit of patient investigation and a conviction of their truth, they were not to be moved from a firm attachment to them, though suffering banishment on account of it. They therefore not only resisted all such insinuating offers, but actually turned upon the parties who had thus dared to tempt them, with powerful arguments in defence of Protestantism. For though they knew how to esteem acts of favour shown to them as strangers and exiles, yet when any great point of truth was assailed, they then deemed it not right to carry their courtesy so far as not to stand up and defend it.

An instance of this will be seen in the case of Episcopius, who, during his residence at Antwerp, was visited by Peter Waddingus, professor of theology among the Jesuits. This gentleman introduced himself by saying that he waited upon him at the wish and direction of the dean of the nunnery Church, merely to pay his respects to him as a stranger and a scholar. On this occasion they had a long conversation on the certainty of faith, and the authority of the writings of the fathers. This interview took place on the 17th of February, in the year 1620; and on the 13th of the following June they had a second meeting, when they had a friendly disputation on the subject of justification. On the 10th of October, Episcopius was invited with Uitenbogaerdt to the residence of some gentleman, to meet the pensionary of Antwerp. During this visit Waddingus made his appearance in company with his colleague, who, it was afterward understood, was expressly invited for the purpose of having an opportunity of conversing with Episcopius on certain subjects in theology. They accordingly entered into a discourse, when the following points were discussed—the Church, the Scriptures, the worship of images, and the authority and infallibility of the pope. This last interview was the occasion of Waddingus producing two letters, the one on *the rule of faith*, the other on *the worship of images*. These letters Episcopius determined to answer, but could not accomplish his purpose, until he had settled in France, when he executed his design in a most masterly way, and refuted in this publication the positions of this Jesuit in favour of the doctrines and worship of the Church of Rome, and sent a copy of the work to Antwerp to him. In thus finishing our account of Episcopius' letters to Waddingus, we have necessarily been carried to a period beyond the regular course of our narrative, and, therefore, must now return to notice the circumstances attending the departure of the Remonstrants from Antwerp.

Here it may be proper to remark, that as the period approached for the termination of the truce between the Spaniards and the Dutch, the exiled ministers deemed it right to prepare to leave Brabant before the war recommenced. Accordingly, Uitenbogaerdt, in company with Borrhius, went to Paris; Episcopius, Grevinchovius, and Cupus, to Cologne, where Episcopius made himself known to Leonardus Marius, regent of the Catholic college of Cologne, of whom he made inquiries as to the possibility of their being permitted to reside there. This gentleman received him very courteously, but gave him to understand that they would not be allowed to have an asylum there, which intimation was soon confirmed by a declaration to the same effect from the public authorities.

On their return to Antwerp, they found there Uitenbogaerdt, who had brought information from Paris which determined them to take up their residence in France. When the people of Brabant learned that they intended to quit Antwerp, measures were adopted to induce them to stay. This was done with the hope of making use of them to effect their objects upon the Netherlands, by exciting the persons attached to them to act in concert with the Spaniards against their country. To induce them to do this they promised to grant them the establishment of their religion in certain towns which might be made subject to Spanish authority. But these men, though persecuted by their countrymen, had not lost their love of their *fatherland*, and received these offers with the strongest marks of displeasure, and indignantly exclaimed "that there was not a single man of their party who would stir a finger in aid of the Spaniards, for all the liberty they might promise them." The pensionary of the city of Antwerp met with no better reception, when making a similar communication to Uitenbogaerdt, who replied "that he must not suppose that the people whom he called Arminians, would give any opportunity to their common enemy to invade their native country to the injury of its inhabitants."

The answer Uitenbogaerdt made on this subject to the marquis of Queva, the Spanish minister in Flanders, will show alike the patriotism and high Christian principle of the Remonstrants. This gentleman sent for this clergyman to Brussels, for the purpose of trying to induce him to stay in Brabant, making him large promises if he would comply with his proposal. After several remarks had passed between them on the subject of the renewal of hostilities, on which occasion the marquis could not forbear admiring the talent, the candour, and freedom displayed by this clergyman: the former stood amazed, says a historian, when he heard this Dutch divine, who had imbibed all the love of liberty that distinguished the Hollanders during the time of William, the great prince of Orange, make the following statement to him :—"Now let me say one word to your excellency freely; that is, that I am not ignorant that your excellency and other great men, and even the clergy themselves, endeavour to keep me and my brethren in this country, not out of any kindness to us and our cause. For though I believe you look upon us to be a peaceable sort of men, and obedient inhabitants, and by no means inclined to raise riots and tumults under the cloak of religion, which though former experience may have taught you to apprehend from the Calvinists, yet nothing of this kind is dreaded by you from us. Nevertheless, we are persuaded that you wish and hope, some time or other, to avail yourselves of our influence with the people of our persuasion, who are very numerous, to raise a rebellion or insurrection by them in the cities of our native country against the government, and thereby strengthen your hands, in the event of hostilities continuing for some time. This I firmly believe is expected from us; as also that we, who have the management of the affairs of the Remonstrants, should from hence make some such attempts. I think it, therefore, my duty to acquaint your excellency in the plainest terms, but with all due respect, and for the information of the king, that these expectations are vain; and that the people of our persuasion in the United Provinces will never be brought so far as to attempt to shake off that yoke which their new lords, by depriving them of their pastors, and consequently of the free exercise of their religion, have put about their neck; and to exchange it for a yoke which they judge to be so much worse. None of us will advise them to do it, and I am sure they would not take such advice, if it were never so much in their power; for all of them have too much love for liberty, and too great an aversion to your nation, ever to be persuaded to attempt it. For though both they and we have been greatly wronged, yet are we not therefore obliged to embrace another religion which we cannot in our conscience approve." "I am amazed at your conduct," said the marquis: "other exiles and people driven out of their native country have been used to try all means to get in again, and to promote whatever methods had a tendency to that end." To this Uitenbogaerdt replied, "Those persons had nothing in view but their own interest or revenge; but we aim at neither, choosing rather to live upon bread and water, and in the utmost distress in foreign countries, than to endeavour to return into our own by unlawful means. For we are Christians, and our hopes are raised to a better life; and, therefore, we dare not do what God has forbidden. Could we be restored to our country by means of a good peace, by which our religion and privileges might be preserved, we should then be pleased; but if not, we must have patience." "You speak very plain," cried the marquis. "Yes, sir," said the other, "I speak the thing as it is, to the end that his majesty may not count upon any insurrection or revolution to be brought about by our people, which will never happen."

After courteously thanking the authorities of Antwerp for the favours shown to them, the Remonstrants left the country, and first went to Rouen, where they stayed a little time, and then departed for Paris. Some of them subsequently returned to the former place. On this occasion the king of France published an edict, in which he declared that he allowed the Remonstrants the same privileges as to other subjects of the States-General who resided in his kingdom, but refused to permit them publicly to celebrate Divine worship among themselves, it being said that his majesty was not willing to allow a third religion to be established in France. Nevertheless, Episcopius was accustomed to preach in the house of Grotius, it being winked at by the authorities. This circumstance will account for the fact of the name of this distinguished individual being so frequently connected with that of the subject of these memoirs, and for the close intimacy which subsisted between them; Grotius himself frequently giving his judgment as to the best mode in which Episcopius should use his powerful pen on behalf of the Remonstrants, and the cause of Arminianism in general.

After publishing his reply to Waddingus' letters, Episcopius wrote a treatise for the instruction and guidance of some among the Remonstrants, in which he showed that it was lawful for a Christian to sustain the office of a magistrate. This treatise was sent into Holland and read with great avidity. Daniel de Breen, a man of learning and high character, and strongly attached to the

Remonstrants, maintained an opposite opinion to Episcopius on this subject, and wrote an answer to his work, which he sent to him in France. The latter replied to this pamphlet merely in the way of appending notes to it in the margin of the copy sent to him, and then returned it to the author. Shortly after he was earnestly solicited by Grotius* to publish some remarks upon the closing part of the eighth, the whole of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which he accordingly did.†. He then engaged in another work, being a refutation of a book written by a Jesuit, named Lessius, under the following title, *Advice as to what Religion and Faith ought to be adopted.* As soon as Grotius heard of his design, he expressed very great satisfaction at the circumstance, and immediately wrote to him, saying "that it was his judgment that he ought, while preparing this writing, to refute the sentiments of those who maintained the principles of Cassander,‡ who asserts, and endeavours to prove 'that those who reject the greater part of the errors of the Church of Rome are, nevertheless, not bound from that circumstance to quit its communion.' In doing this," says Grotius, "it is my judgment that you should bring under consideration the two following points: first, 'whether an act, in itself justifiable, namely, to exhibit a visible form of worship in the holy sacrament, becomes unlawful on account of the interpretation given to it by the heads of a Church, who say that such an action has Christ for its object as really present under the consecrated bread, as well as being also the visible sign itself.' The second is, 'whether any person can lawfully attach himself to a community whose rulers declare that the admission of certain doctrines which he disapproves, is necessary to a communion with them, though they do not require from individual members an open and unequivocal avowal of the same.'" Episcopius drew out a draft of this intended work, which, however, he never completed, being prevented, undoubtedly, by the multiplicity of his engagements.

---

* Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ et Theologicæ, p. 681.

† See Episcopii Opera, vol. i, part ii.

‡ This gentleman, who was born in 1515, in the island of Cadsand, was a Catholic divine, and endeavoured to unite the Papists and Protestants, or rather to bring over the latter to the Church of Rome. He was very learned, modest, and amiable. As is usual with the person who undertakes to arbitrate between contending parties, he offended both. The positions he advanced, in order to prove that the Protestants might lawfully enter the bosom of the Papist Church, offended them, as will be seen by Grotius wishing Episcopius to attack those stated in the text; while the concessions he made to the Protestants to reconcile them, offended the Catholics, and some of his works were censured, and others condemned by the Council of Trent.

In the year 1623, prior to the meeting of a provincial synod of the Calvinist ministers to be held at Charenton, Uitenbogaerdt, Episcopius, and some other Remonstrants purposed to apply for leave to appear in it, in order to give an explanation of their affairs, on which occasion they intended stating their doctrines, and giving an account of the treatment they had met with from the Synod of Dort. This circumstance arose from the fact of Stephen Curcellæus,* who subsequently became an eminent professor among the Remonstrants, and was then minister at Amiens, having been ejected from his office the March preceding by the synod held at Charenton, because he could not conscientiously subscribe to the canons of the Synod of Dort, which the French national synod at Alez had ordered should be done by all the ministers throughout their Churches. This gentleman applied to Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius for assistance and direction, who, together with Corvinus, Goulart, and Francis d'Or,† met at the

---

* Curcellæus, who was thus ejected from his office by the French Calvinists, in consequence of his attachment to the doctrines of Arminius, was a distinguished scholar. The editors of the *Nouveau Dictionaire Historique* say of him, "Ayant été déposé, il passa en Hollande, et se fit un grand nom parmi les Protestans Arminiens. Il professa la théologie dans leurs écoles, après le célèbre Simon Episcopius."

† Francis d'Or, here named, was a minister of the Reformed Church in Sedan, but had embraced the doctrines of the Remonstrants. After the Synod of Dort, he was expounding the first chapter of St. James in the presence of some of his brother ministers of the French Church; and when he came to the thirteenth verse, he attempted to prove that God was not the author of sin. His colleagues were offended at him, and on the following day he was summoned before a tribunal of clergy and laity, deposed from his pulpit, and finally compelled to leave the town.

Tilenus, who had been a rigid Calvinist, was brought over to the doctrines of Arminius by reading the works of Corvinus. He also was deposed from his professorship by the same gentlemen, and house of Daniel Tilenus, formerly professor of theology in Sedan, and after deliberating on the subject, finally determined upon drawing up a document to be presented to the synod, containing a complaint against the Synod of Alez, and showing how unsound were the premises on which the decisions of the Synod of Dort were founded, and the falsehood of those statements by which the character and doctrines of the Remonstrants were defamed; stating, at the same time, that they wished to have a conference with the members of the synod, on which occasion they would more fully demonstrate the truth of their assertions. In this document it was declared "that if these ministers consented to the holding of such a conference, the Remonstrants would go into a full statement of their affairs and doctrines, but if they rejected the proposal, they should then consider such conduct as an evidence that the members of the synod wished to avoid inquiry, and thereby showed that they admitted that neither their cause nor

---

subsequently settled in Paris, and lived on his private fortune. He became a powerful defender of the sentiments of Arminius. Our King James, who had concurred in the condemnation of the doctrines of the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort, sent for Tilenus to England, and offered him a pension if he would stay in this country; and in a conversation with him, strongly reprobated the decrees of the synod passed in favour of Calvinism. Tilenus published a work in defence of the Remonstrants, against the members of the Synod of Alez, on the ground of their *falsely* and *calumniously* charging the Remonstrants with Pelagianism, "whereas," he said, "they believed and taught just the opposite doctrines, preaching against Manicheism, without so much as maintaining one single point of the doctrine of Pelagius. They believed and taught 'that election depended upon God, and not on man; that men ought to ascribe to the grace of God, the beginning, the middle, and the end of every good action; that even regenerated persons could neither think, will, nor do any good thing, nor resist any temptation to evil, without a previous and exciting, a consequent and co-operating grace.' The Remonstrants were also ready to assert," he said, "and prove four things upon this head:—1. That in this controversy their doctrine entirely agreed with that of the primitive fathers, who wrote before Pelagius was born. 2. That they did not maintain one single point of those articles which the councils had condemned in Pelagius. 3. That the chief adversaries of Pelagius, such as St. Austin, Jerome, and others, in their writings against Pelagius, did not attack one opinion maintained by Arminius or his followers. 4. That the synodical gentlemen of Dort and Alez openly opposed several points, which both the fathers and councils maintained in relation to Pelagianism."—*Brandt*.

their doctrines would stand the test of examination." Such an intended measure on the part of the Remonstrants, while it displayed their courage, and the conviction they had that they were capable of discomfiting the members of this assembly, was not, however, carried into effect, as that body at that time came to terms with Curcellæus.

In the same winter, Episcopius composed a work designated, *An Examination of the Theses of James Capellus,** *Professor of Sedan, in which the latter professed to enter upon an inquiry into the disputes which had agitated the Low Countries, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it had been better to tolerate or suppress the opinions of Arminius.* This writing of Episcopius was sent into Holland, and published there immediately. Scarcely was this work out of his hands when he was called upon to defend the common cause of the Arminians, against a renegade of the name of Nicholas Bodecherus. This man, when he saw all the good things transferred from the Remonstrants to the Calvinists, by the condemnation passed upon the former at the Synod of Dort, united himself to the latter party, and, playing the part of a true apostate, began to abuse and defame his former friends.

---

* In this work the writer declares that the Arminians detract from the Divine Power, by asserting that man can oppose, and effectually resist, the Divine Omnipotence. "To this false representation," says Mr. Nichols, "the eloquent Episcopius returned the following answer, which is worthy of attentive consideration: "These expressions are unappropriate; because nothing can be detracted from Divine Power, where that Divine Power is not exerted. In the conversion of man, Capellus supposes God to employ 'his *ordinary power*, which at all times, and by its own force, produces its effect.' Those persons against whom he disputes, deny this assertion by the subjoined argument: 'Wherever that power is employed, *which, at all times, and by its own force, produces its effect*, there is no place left either for precepts, promises, or threatenings, and therefore none either for obedience or disobedience, for reward or punishment. It is the will of Him who commands any thing, that his commands should be performed by him to whom he issues those commands. But when he performs that thing himself, it is not his will that it should be performed by another; otherwise he would, at the same, be both *willing* and *unwilling* for it to be performed by another. But wherever no place is left to precepts, there is none left to obedience or disobedience, and consequently none to promises or threatenings, to rewards or punishment.'"

This he did in a pamphlet bearing the following title, *Socinian Remonstrantism; or, A Clear Demonstration that the Remonstrants in many parts of their Confession, either in deed, word, or method, agree with the Socinians.* It appears that Episcopius had no very great respect for this man's mental powers, for he immediately replied to this work in a pamphlet in Latin, entitled, *Bodecherus, the Simple; or, A Clear Demonstration that Nicholas Bodecherus has displayed more than ordinary flattering servility, for the purpose of gaining the favour of the Contra-Remonstrants, and has lately very foolishly and weakly attempted to charge the Confession of the Remonstrants with Socinianism.*

About this time Episcopius felt inclined to take a tour through the southern parts of France, merely for the purpose of becoming better acquainted with the country. He accordingly left Paris on the 16th of May, and returned in the commencement of July. Immediately after, he deemed it proper to turn his attention to the subject of the freedom of the will. He was led to this from a persuasion that this question stood intimately connected with the doctrine of predestination, and that the one could not be rightly understood without correct views of the other. He therefore immediately commenced a work on this subject, in which he refuted the common opinion, which maintains that in the mind of man there are two powers or faculties, really distinct from each other; namely, the understanding and the will. That the understanding simply comprehends, without being able to desire or will; and that the will only desires and wills, without being able to comprehend; and that the mind, through these two faculties or powers, performs all its operations. Episcopius most ably refuted this theory, upon the following grounds; viz., that, according to it, one of these two positions must be admitted; either that the will inevitably follows that which the understanding comprehends, and as all the operations of the understanding are necessary, consequently, all the actions of men are necessary: or that the determinations of the will are in all cases the result of blind instinctive impulse; and, therefore, that all the actions of men are the result of mere chance and accident; both which positions are equally absurd. To show the fallacy of this system, Episcopius maintained that the mind itself immediately both comprehends and wills, so that the understanding and will are not really two faculties and powers of the mind, distinct from each other, but two operations which the mind itself originates. Upon this postulate he shows how both the above absurdities may be avoided, and in what manner a man may freely regulate his conduct, either in accordance with, or in opposition to the dictate of reason. This work was not published till after his death, nevertheless, its argument was brought before the public the same year, in consequence of Episcopius having entered into an examination of the sentiments of John Cameron, who had been professor of theology for some years at Saumur, and whose sentiments on the human will some thought to be less objectionable, and involving fewer absurdities, than the opinion commonly maintained on the irresistibility of Divine influence. Basing his theory on the common opinion that the understanding and the will were two powers of the mind, really distinct from each other, Cameron asserted "that the will necessarily followed the apprehensions and decisions of the understanding; and that the will was depraved only as a consequence of the absence of an enlightened judgment, to direct and impel it to the performance of that which ought to be done; while, to produce a right inclination in the will, it was only necessary that there should be an enlightened judgment, which was to be produced by the removal of those obstacles that prevented the understanding from forming a correct apprehension of things. For in the latter case, the will would be so powerfully affected by such an apprehension, that it could not fail to be influenced thereby to choose that which is right and good; and, therefore, to secure the regeneration of man, it is only necessary that the understanding be enlightened; and in proportion as this is more or less effected, in the same degree the conversion of man is more or less complete." This theory Episcopius closely examined, and animadverted upon in a small pamphlet, proving most convincingly that it was chargeable with all the absurdities to which the commonly received opinion was subject, on the irresistibility of Divine influence in the conversion of man; and clearly demonstrated that this system made the whole of man's acting the result of necessity, seeing that all the operations of the understanding were necessary; and that a man must unavoidably comprehend clearly a matter *distinctly* placed before him, and could not understand clearly that which was *obscurely* presented to him, but he must inevitably comprehend it as it came before him. Since, then, the will, according to these positions, necessarily follows the apprehension and judgment of the understanding, consequently all the actions of men are necessary.*

This work contained many other powerful arguments in refutation of the sentiments of Cameron. It was sent in the form of an epistle to a celebrated scholar residing in Paris, by the name of Edmund Mercer. This gentleman had been educated in the Catholic religion, to which his parents, who were very opulent persons, were rigidly attached, and in consequence of his embracing the doctrines of the Reformed Church, he had forfeited their favour. On his subsequently examining the writings of the Remonstrants, he adopted their sentiments, was persecuted by the Reformed or Calvinists, and was actually reduced to great poverty. Nevertheless, neither the sufferings he endured, the scorn he was subject to from the Reformed, nor the entreaties of his parents, accompanied with splendid promises made by them, to induce him to forsake those doctrines which he believed to be of God, could cause him to abandon them; but, on the contrary, he preferred to live in poverty, with an open avowal of his attachment to Arminianism, and a good conscience, than obtain the enjoyment of riches and the favour of the world, at the expense of principle and peace of mind. This person published Episcopius' letter, without his knowledge, under the following title: *A Letter of a learned Man to his Friend, containing an Inquiry into the Sentiments of John Cameron, on the Grace of God, and the Freedom of the Human Will.* Cameron replied to this, and ungenerously charged Episcopius with vanity, in consequence of the title of *learned man* being prefixed to this letter, as though he had so designated himself, when he must have known that it was the act of another person.

---

* The above passage, which is literally translated from the Latin copy of Limborch's Life of Episcopius, collated with the one in Dutch, is here given to retain the order of the narrative, and we leave the reader to form his judgment of the theories thus stated.

About this period Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius designed paying a visit to Holstein; and for this purpose they agreed with a merchant of Rouen to carry them to Quillebouef in a Hamburgh vessel; and they accordingly arrived in that place on the first of September. They stayed there one night, where they were recognized by the captain of a ship from Amsterdam. They then sailed for Havre de Grace, where, being detained by contrary winds, their captain went on shore, where he met the one from Amsterdam, who asked him "if he knew the persons whom he had on board his vessel?" "No," he said, "only they appeared to be two respectable persons, and he supposed them to be father and son, having a servant with them." "You are mistaken," said the other, "the one is Uitenbogaerdt, the other Episcopius, and if you will detain them, but especially the old man, and bring them into Holland, I can assure you of being rewarded with a new vessel, or what is equal to its value." The captain heard this statement with great surprise, and immediately left the inn and hastened on board, when he politely asked his passengers who they were, adding "that he had a special reason for making the inquiry." Uitenbogaerdt then frankly told him their names and circumstances. The captain proceeded immediately to relate what had taken place at the inn, presenting his hand to Uitenbogaerdt, and promising, at the same time, to act toward them with honour and fidelity; adding "that the treacherous measures he had been counselled to take by the captain from Amsterdam, he would scorn to adopt, were the value of two vessels offered him to betray them." They then asked him what measures they should adopt, in the event of a Dutch man-of-war coming into the port, as it was probable they might be boarded. He said they need be under no fear of this taking place, as he came from a free port, and was under a neutral flag; neither would it be suffered by the French authorities, while they were lying on the coast of France. But Episcopius and Uitenbogaerdt judged that the Amsterdam captain would give information of them, and that the commander of a Dutch man-of-war would be disposed to risk all consequences, for the purpose of securing them, and obtaining the reward which he knew would be given for conducting them into Holland. They therefore requested the master to watch the approach of any ship of war. On the following day one hove in sight, and they instantly prepared to leave the vessel, and landed on the French coast. Scarcely had they got safely on shore, before a Dutch officer boarded the vessel which they had left, and having searched it, expressed great mortification at not finding them. Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius now gave up their intended journey, and hastened back to Rouen, giving thanks to God, who had thus enabled them to escape the hands of their enemies.*

Episcopius now prepared to reply to Cameron's letter. This work, on which he appears to have bestowed much labour, and have put forth the full strength of his powers, he sent, in manuscript, to Grotius and Tilenus, for their judgment upon it. Grotius, in a letter to his brother, expressed his opinion of this work in the following words: "Episcopius has learnedly replied to Cameron. I have read the manuscript, and I must say that I am astonished at the diligence and power of intellect manifested by the writer." In a letter to the author himself, he says, "I have read with great pleasure and profit that which you have written in reply to Cameron. I judge your arguments and answers to be very solid and forcible." Tilenus gave his opinion of the work thus: "Certainly the arguments you have advanced are sufficient to satisfy and confound your opponent; and if they do not cure him, it will only be because he is incurable. The work must be published, if no other end were to be accomplished by it, than that of convincing this vain man,† and exposing those foolish and conceited notions that he has of his own importance and capability." Episcopius, encouraged by the judgment of these two learned men, sent his manuscript into Holland, to my father, says Limborch, who had married the daughter of his brother, Rem Bisschop, requesting him to superintend the printing of it. But on his hearing shortly after that Cameron had departed this life, he immediately wrote to Holland, forbidding the publication of it, assigning, as his reason, "that it would be ungenerous to attack the writings of a person who was now no longer capable of defending himself." To this his friends replied "that though Cameron was dead, his sentiments remained, and that there were many who advocated his doctrines, and it was necessary to print the work to undeceive them." But he refused to listen to the above and similar statements.

---

* That the venerable Uitenbogaerdt had sufficient reason to dread falling into the hands of Maurice, will appear from the fact of the latter having, at the time this minister made his escape, sent soldiers to search his house, who drove their swords through the beds where they thought he might be concealed. He also despatched others to seize him on the road by which it was supposed he might escape. And when a report was made to the prince that he could not be found, he exclaimed, with signs of deep mortification, "Now I shall never catch the bird!"

† This statement of Tilenus, certainly not very honourable to the memory of Cameron, might have sprung from mortified feelings.

On his return into Holland, he was again and again pressed not to withhold so learned and masterly a performance, the more especially as the disciples of Cameron had asserted that Episcopius was incompetent to overturn the positions laid down by him in his letter addressed to Episcopius. The friends of the latter were deeply mortified at this circumstance, well knowing that the work in question was a triumphant refutation of the Scotchman's sentiments. But he remained unmoved, his independence and dignity of mind not allowing him to attack the name of a man who could not stand upon his own defence. How different was this manly conduct from that of the Calvinistic antagonists of Episcopius at the Synod of Dort, who not only refused to allow him to attempt to refute their sentiments, but also to state his own; while,

---

He had had an argumentative encounter with Cameron, on the concurrence of grace with the human will, in the calling of men to salvation. The conference was held at L'Isle, at the country seat of M. Groslot, near Orleans. It commenced on the 20th, and concluded on the 28th of April, 1620. Two of Cameron's disciples, Lewis Capellus and De la Milletiere, took notes, and gave their version of the disputation, to the disadvantage of Tilenus, who was not favoured like his antagonist with the help of friends to make minutes on the occasion. This may account for the above severe remarks on this learned Scotchman, for such he certainly was, having delivered lectures on the Greek language when he was twenty years of age.

on the contrary, Festus Hommius drew up certain propositions, saying they contained the opinions of Episcopius on certain points, and though disavowed and proved to be false by the latter, nevertheless the synod proceeded to condemn him on this surreptitious document and others, which, if not similar, were not acknowledged as standard publications by which to judge of the doctrines of the Remonstrants. This writing of Episcopius was published after his decease, and it is to be found in the second volume of his works.

During the time that Episcopius was preparing this publication, he suffered the painful loss of his brother, Rem Bisschop, who has so frequently been named in these memoirs. We are not surprised that he should acutely feel this stroke, inasmuch as he was indebted to the paternal care of this gentleman for the education he had received. He was much older than the subject of these memoirs, and when his father was removed by the plague of 1602, he watched over our Episcopius with peculiar affection, and for all his solicitude was amply rewarded in marking the early development of his extraordinary talents, and the fame that he soon acquired; and not more could a father rejoice in the elevation of a son, than Rem Bisschop did in seeing him raised to the highest office which, as a theologian, he could attain in his own country. And when he was suffering banishment for the maintenance of his opinions, we are inclined to believe he contributed in no small measure to his support and comfort. This gentleman died on the 10th of April, 1622, an event which Episcopius recorded with deep sorrow and the strongest marks of affection, stating "that he had lost in him not only a brother, but a father." Grotius, hearing of the circumstance, instantly wrote to his friend, bearing the following testimony in favour of this distinguished and pious Dutchman:—"I have heard of the death of your brother, which has occasioned me as much grief as though he had been my own brother; and while I am fully sensible that his loss will be lamented by every good man who knew him, yet it will be more especially felt by you, the calamities of whose exile were lightened by nothing so much as by his affectionate and tender kindness toward you."

In the same month his excellency, Prince Maurice, died, and was immediately succeeded in the Stadtholdership by his amiable brother, Prince Henry. This gentleman, whom we have before mentioned, was the son of the celebrated Louisa de Coligny, a lady who had embraced the sentiments of the Remonstrants, and showed particular friendship to Uitenbogaerdt, and even wept in his presence when she found that it was expedient for him to escape, in order to save his life. Her esteem for this venerable minister led her to appoint him to be the preceptor of her son, requesting him to instruct him in the principles of religion, while he initiated him in the classics. This office Uitenbogaerdt held for some time, and therefore it is no matter of surprise that the prince embraced the religious sentiments of this clergyman, and greatly venerated him. This he especially manifested on two separate occasions, when Uitenbogaerdt, while in banishment, waited upon him as he passed through Antwerp, and received from him decisive marks of friendship, favour, and compassion.

The elevation of this gentleman to the first office in the States of Holland, induced Episcopius and Uitenbogaerdt to think of returning to their native land. For although they were aware that the prince would be beset by bigots, who would endeavour to persuade him to persecute them, yet they had confidence in his clemency and kindness, and believed he would shield them; and, therefore, they determined to return home. Twelve months, however, elapsed before they put their purpose into execution. Episcopius first left France for Holland. This was on the 12th of July, 1626, when he bade farewell to Uitenbogaerdt in the following words: "This is a sorrowful adieu to you, my most faithful friend; may God preserve you in peace, till I see you again in your fatherland." They each repeated their affectionate farewell by letters, and Uitenbogaerdt in one of his, which met Episcopius at a certain place on his journey, thus expressed himself: "How much I feel your absence it is utterly impossible for me to describe; God alone knows what I feel on the occasion. We must, however, bear this separation with resignation, since a man of Macedonia says, *Come over, and help us*; and God designs that you should attend the call and go, and that I should remain behind, and be willing to give you up, that you may devote to his service the many weighty and splendid gifts which he has bestowed upon you for that purpose; while I, who am worn out, and henceforth incapable of active service, must wait in loneliness and sorrow his last coming. Go then, in the name of the Lord, *animæ dimidium meæ.* And the Lord, who has called you, will watch over you, and give you success in your journey.

On the 25th of July Episcopius arrived at Havre de Grace, and on the 29th of the same month landed at Rotterdam. His return was soon known among his friends, who flew to welcome him with the strongest signs of satisfaction and joy. The venerable Uitenbogaerdt, lonely in his situation, could not tarry long behind the man who had been his constant companion in exile, and whom he had significantly and affectionately designated *the half of himself*, and therefore followed him after the lapse of two months, and arrived at Rotterdam on the 26th of September. These two great champions of the Arminian cause, says Limborch, having arrived in their own country, instantly prepared to farther its interests. Uitenbogaerdt thought it would not be well for him to appear in public for some time, while Episcopius attended the meetings of the Remonstrants, and soon began to preach among them.

After Episcopius' return to Holland, he prepared to execute a work on which he had been intent for some time, but had hitherto been prevented from commencing, that is, *A defence of the Confession of the Remonstrants against the attacks which had been made upon it by the professors of the University of Leyden.* These gentlemen, the reader will recollect, had succeeded Episcopius and other Remonstrants in their offices, and of course found it expedient to prove themselves to be more orthodox than their predecessors, by showing that the latter were heretics, and to justify their being elected to these eminent stations. Nevertheless, these professors allowed five years to elapse before they prepared their attack upon the Confession of the Remonstrants. At the time their *Censure* made its appearance, Episcopius was at Rouen, and from all sides he was pressed by his friends to reply to it. Not being able to enter upon the work immediately, he drew up the excellent address to the Remonstrant ministers, which now stands as a preface to his apology for the Confession. While he was proceeding with this work, Wallæus published a Dutch edition of the *Censure* in 1627, and in a preface to it addressed to the States-General advanced certain charges against the Remonstrants, which prompted Episcopius more speedily to execute his extended, masterly, and certainly, in some places, caustic reply. It was, however, not completed till 1628, and then its publication was delayed two years. This arose from the fact of Episcopius considering that, as this work was to be a vindication of the doctrines of the Remonstrant body, he ought not to publish it till he had first submitted it to the leading members of the community for their approval. It was, therefore, first sent to the Louvestein, to be examined by seven of the ministers who had been condemned to perpetual imprisonment. These gentlemen instantly copied it, and subsequently sent their remarks upon it to its author; those of Niellius were numerous. It was also sent to several other persons, who expressed their approval of it. Uitenbogaerdt having examined it, gave his judgment upon it in a letter to Episcopius, written on the 19th of February, 1620, in the following words: "I have read your apology with great satisfaction and admiration. It is such, indeed, that I do not know how its sentiments can be refuted. That your adversaries will endeavour to do this is most probable; but he who will make the attempt will be convinced by his own efforts of the folly of such an undertaking. I confess that it contains several things above my comprehension, for I am not sufficiently versed in many of the topics of which it treats to pronounce a judgment upon them; and, therefore, my being unqualified at present to decide accurately upon them renders me very anxious to see it published, that I may the more closely examine, and become better acquainted with them." After receiving various remarks upon this work, and testimonies in its favour, Episcopius at length published it.

When Wallæus found that the misrepresentations of the Contra-Remonstrants to the States-General did not bring the displeasure of the latter upon the Remonstrants, he took a more insidious method of injuring them, by introducing certain propositions into the university of Leyden for discussion, on four of the disputed points of the Arminians, in which he endeavoured to show the terms on which the Dutch Church would receive them again into its bosom; attempting at the same time to prove the practicability of their complying with them; and asserted that their rejection of them would be the result of haughty contumacy, and not of the dictate of a righteous conscience. Episcopius instantly attacked, and exposed the sophistry and dictatorial requirements of his successor. Though much occupied at this time with these publications, he, nevertheless, found time to write a small pamphlet on the ordinary means of man's conversion, which was occasioned by certain disputes which had existed among the Anabaptists of Waterland on that subject.

As the proceedings just alluded to on the part of these bigoted spirits, to bring down the arm of power upon the Remonstrant ministers who had returned into Holland, were in vain, they beheld them preaching and attending to the duties of their pastoral office, and collecting and building up their scattered flocks with deep mortification. This feeling betrayed them into conduct that tore away the mask of hypocrisy under which they had acted; for when the clergy and consistories of the Church were charged with being the authors of the sufferings of the Remonstrants, they had always attempted to justify themselves by asserting that they were not parties to the measures adopted against them, and that the whole proceeded from the free and unsought acts of the States-General. Now the hollowness and hypocrisy, says Limborch, of this statement appeared to all, for as the latter were now seen to throw the shield of protection over the Arminians, they again and again petitioned the States to enforce their proclamations, forbidding their religious assemblies; and thus they appeared in their true character, as relentless persecutors. Not satisfied with petitioning the States, a deputation from the consistories was appointed to appear before them to request the suppression of public worship among the Remonstrants. The persons sent on this errand were particularly charged to wait privately upon the members of that assembly to induce them to comply with the wishes of the consistories. The ministers of Amsterdam formed a part of this deputation; and as Triglandius was one, we will put it to the reader to judge, when he recollects the conduct of this man named at page 387, on the arrest of Welsing, the Arminian clergyman, whether such a charge in his case was not quite superfluous. This reviler of the Arminians needed no stimulus, beyond his own bitter enmity to them, to prompt him to endeavour to effect their ruin. Episcopius, aware of the embassy of these meek ministers, wrote a pamphlet on their mission, entitled, *The Edict-hunting Religion of the Contra-Remonstrants, and especially of some of the Ministers at Amsterdam*. But a work on the same subject being published by Uitenbogaerdt, rendered that of Episcopius unnecessary. He, however, wrote another pamphlet, and published it under the following title: *The Freedom of Religious Worship; being a Dialogue between a Remonstrant and a Contra-Remonstrant, on the Subject of tolerating the Religious Worship of the Remonstrants.* This production was occasioned by the Calvinist ministers declaring from their pulpits that the celebration of public worship by the Arminians ought to be prevented.

The efforts of these gentlemen to induce the civil authorities to prohibit these religious assemblies being unavailing, the Remonstrants now began to build churches, or appropriate other places for public worship in various parts of the provinces; and, desiring to have uniformity of service in the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper throughout all their congregations, Episcopius was requested to draw up a formulary to be used for the celebration of these two ordinances. This was printed and subsequently abridged, and appended to the Catechism used in the Arminian Churches. The Remonstrant ministers, says Limborch, now began to appear in the public streets; and we read only of one instance of an attempt being made to seize any of them. This happened to Episcopius and Uitenbogaerdt while they were upon a journey, which, in all probability, was the act of an officious and unauthorized sheriff of a town through which they were passing.*

---

* Grotius, learning that these ministers were thus unmolested, endeavoured also to obtain a residence in Holland, and went and

The affairs of the Remonstrants now assuming so interesting an aspect, Episcopius began to think of entering the marriage state, and chose Maria, the daughter of Jans Pesser and the widow of Henry Niellius, to be his wife. She was of an honourable family, resided at Rotterdam, and was very pious, amiable, and intelligent. That he might meet with no opposition to the celebration of his nuptials from any bigoted Contra-Remonstrant zealot, who might take fire when he heard the name of Episcopius announced, he deemed it proper to have himself registered by that of Egbert, his mother's maiden name. On the 8th of September, 1630, when he appeared in the council house of Rotterdam, where the marriage was celebrated, the secretary of the court, after reading his name as Simon Egbert, looked at him and, recognizing him, turned to the schepens or aldermen present, and said, "Gentlemen, is not this Episcopius, who was banished the country?" They not attending to his question, he repeated it, but their designed inattention to his repetition of it showed him that his conduct was displeasing to them, and he was silent; and the marriage was celebrated without farther interruption. Among those who congratulated Episcopius on this occasion, was

abode there for some time. But though he had many friends, yet he found it impossible to continue, as an order was issued for the seizing of his person. He therefore returned to Paris, and subsequently went to Stockholm. Still feeling the *mal du pais*, he determined once more to hazard a return to his native country. Setting sail for Lubeck, a storm arose, and the vessel was driven upon the coast of Pomerania. During the passage he fell sick, and after being landed, was conveyed, by a tedious journey of eight days, to Rostock. Feeling his end approach, he sent for a Lutheran minister, who exhorted him to look to Jesus Christ for salvation. He replied, "I place my hopes on Jesus Christ alone;" and then, with his hands joined in the attitude of supplication, he repeated, after the minister, a prayer used by the Lutherans, commencing thus: "Heer Jesu, wahr mensch und Gott, &c.;" that is, *Lord Jesus, true man and God;* and shortly after expired.

But though, while dying, Grotius confessed himself to be as the publican, and admitted the Divinity of Christ, and expressed himself as depending wholly on his merit for acceptance with God, yet the bitter spirit of some of the Calvinists did not scruple to publish that he died a Socinian, a Papist, nay, even an Atheist.—*Enfield's History of Philosophy*, *Burigny's Grotius, and Bayle;* article, Grotius.

his friend Grotius, who wrote to him from Paris, saying "that the place which gave birth to the distinguished Erasmus was worthy to witness such an event."

The Apology for the Confession of the Remonstrants, published by Episcopius, had by this time been extensively read, and obtained them many friends among the more tolerant of the Dutch people, as well as in other countries. This was deeply mortifying to the bigoted Contra-Remonstrants, and they *now* more violently than ever charged them with being Socinians. Of the character of the evidences by which these accusations were attempted to be supported the reader may judge, when he is informed that the principal one was the fact of the Remonstrants not having openly denounced those who had adopted the doctrines of Socinus, and avowed their belief of the utter impossibility of their salvation. They also endeavoured the more speciously to fasten this charge upon them, by attributing to Episcopius the publication of an anonymous work, of whose author he was perfectly ignorant. It appeared under the following title, *The Peace and Unity of the Church;* and contained a defence of Socinianism. It was subsequently discovered to be the production of a Polish nobleman by the name of Samuel Pripkovius.

Not being able to bring odium upon the Remonstrants by these charges of heresy, the deputies from the provincial Calvinistic synods memorialized the States-General, praying that the religious assemblies of the Remonstrants might be prohibited. To give effect to this application, they appended to the memorial certain extracts from the Apology for the Confession, which they supposed would further their object by rendering the Arminians offensive to the civil authorities. This document was at first thought to be the joint production of the Leyden professors, but it was afterward discovered to have originated with Episcopius' old enemy, Festus Hommius. These gentlemen, however, soon showed themselves to be worthy compeers of this personage in his measures of bigotry and slander, for they shortly after published a work, entitled, *A Specimen of the Calumnies and Heterodox Opinions of the Remonstrants, as extracted from their Apology and published as a Forerunner, designed to act as a Warn-*

ing to all true Christians. This was published in Latin and Dutch, but the more complete refutation, of which this was said to be the *forerunner*, never made its appearance. Uitenbogaerdt published an answer to this work in Dutch. Episcopius also wrote one in the same language, which, however, never appeared in print; but he subsequently composed a more extended reply to this 'SPECIMEN' of the Leyden professors, in which every thing which was laid to the charge of the Remonstrants was refuted, article by article, and many arguments advanced, by way of showing why the Remonstrants scrupled to condemn and openly denounce others, when they were not authorized so to do by the Scriptures. We are not surprised that these men, who had themselves been denounced by the Calvinists, and whose denunciation was the preliminary to confiscation of property, banishment, a dungeon, or death, should hesitate to show their orthodoxy, by asserting of any persons that the dogmas they held were the signs of their being the enemies of God, and the reprobates of heaven, and, therefore, might justly be hunted down by men. Independently of the remembrance of what they had suffered tending to guard them against such measures, we say that their piety and their creed alike forbade their doing it. The Arminian clergy had boldly attacked and triumphantly refuted the doctrines of the Socinians, and yet because they hesitated to add to their refutations, anathemas, and denunciations, leaving the work of condemning a weak and erring fellow-creature to final perdition, to Him whose alone is the righteous prerogative of fixing the everlasting destiny of men, they were thus charged with being Socinians and heretics by their Calvinistic opponents. How far the reader will think this was justifiable ground for thus criminating them we cannot say; only we would here remark that for any person to indulge in the supposed right to denounce others in vindication of the truth, and thereby to prove his orthodoxy, is a dangerous course for a weak and excitable creature like man to pursue. For, in so acting, he is liable to lose the charities of our holy religion, and confound hatred to certain persons with zeal for religion; and, while cherishing a vindictive forethought of the destiny of a heretic, he may not only acquire the malignity of misanthropy, but form his views of the Divine Being under such excitements, and thereby be led to contemplate him as the patron of a sect, instead of the tender Father of all those who love and fear him.

CHAPTER XVII.

The reader will recollect that we have more than once referred to the fact of certain Arminian clergymen being confined in the Louvestein, under sentence of imprisonment for life. They were eight in number before Poppius, who, for his holy and devoted spirit, might be considered the Fletcher of the Remonstrants, was removed from his prison by death, "to range at large," according to his own words, "in the delightful paradise of God." The names of the remaining seven were, Carolus Niellius, Peter Cupus, Bernerus Vesekius, Simon Lucas Bysterus, Theodore Bomius, Paul Lyndenius, and Arnoldus Geesteranus. Some of these had been confined for seven years, others eight, and Bysterus even ten. Since the elevation of Prince Frederic to the Stadtholdership, measures had been again and again adopted by their friends to procure their release; but all in vain. Had this amiable gentleman, who was the grandfather of our William III., been allowed to follow the dictate of his own feelings, he would, from his esteem for the Remonstrant ministers, and love of religious liberty, have immediately released them. But, though he succeeded to his brother's office, he did not succeed to his power; for the persons whom Maurice had elevated to authority during the revolution he created, were opposed to Prince Frederic on the ground of his attachment to the Remonstrants; and one of these, a leading personage among them, had gone so far as to tell the princess dowager, "that, if her son did not take other counsels," that is, show himself opposed to the Arminians, "he should not be invested with the government at his brother's decease." And this lady, being attended by Curcellæus during her last illness, declared to this minister, says Brandt, that she apprehended that her son was in danger of his life on account of his affection for the Remonstrants. This circumstance will account for his not openly interfering in behalf of the imprisoned ministers, lest he should bring upon himself the wrath of the bigots by whom he was surrounded.

These clergymen, therefore, finding that all attempts to obtain their release by the intervention of their friends proved abortive, seriously began to think of making their escape, which they finally effected. A train of circumstances marked this event worthy of notice, of which the following is not the least interesting:—A soldier, performing duty at the Louvestein, had on several occasions behaved very rudely to these prisoners on the ground of his supposing that they were the advocates of certain sentiments which he abhorred, among which was the doctrine of reprobation. His wife, who, it appears, was allowed to have a residence with him within the walls of the castle, had been recently confined, and the child being supposed to be near death, the necessity of the case overcame the soldier's dislike to these ministers, and he applied to Niellius to baptize it. On this occasion Niellius and he entered into conversation, when, to the utter surprise of the man, he found that the incarcerated ministers were suffering imprisonment on account of the doctrines that he himself cordially believed. From this time he became as courteous and civil as he had before been rude and insulting, and gave them hints in a way that they understood of his willingness to serve them. The plan determined upon for their escape was that of letting themselves down by a rope from the wall of the castle, on that side where the river Waal or Rhine washes its foundations, it having no other defence there. Here they were to be received by a boat manned by expert rowers. When it was proposed that they should escape from the wall, Niellius demurred at this plan. His objection arose from the following circumstance. The governor of the castle had frequently permitted them to walk on the walls as a means of contributing to their health and enjoyment, a promise being exacted from them that they would not attempt to escape on such occasions. Niellius, therefore, judged himself bound to continue in the prison till he was either dismissed by the authorities of the land, or could make his escape some other way. The other six maintained that they were only bound by their promise during those times, and so long as they were permitted by the governor to walk upon the walls; and that their promise could by no means be considered as binding them not to attempt to escape at other seasons, when they were not allowed this indulgence. For a long time Niellius resisted the plan merely as a matter of conscience, judging that his pledge to the governor ought to prevent him from making an attempt to escape according to this arrangement. He at length, however, consented, and the night was fixed upon for carrying their plan into execution, when the soldier alluded to was to be stationed nearest to that part of the wall whence they intended to make their escape.

Two difficulties, however, still stood in the way, and their early removal was viewed by these ministers as a special interference of Providence. Near to the place where they intended to let themselves down, reeds had grown to a very great height, and to so great a breadth in the water as completely to prevent the boat coming close up to the wall. But these had also formed a hiding place for some Spanish robbers, who, when passengers came down the river, rushed upon them in a small boat, plundered them of their property, and bore them away to the Spanish territory, from whence they were not liberated without paying a ransom. This occasioned remonstrances to be sent to the governor of the castle, who cleared the whole of the reeds away; and thus a passage was opened up to the wall, by which the boat could come and receive them.

The second impediment was from a very large dog kept by the governor, and placed in that part of the castle from which these ministers intended to make their escape to the wall; and they apprehended that his barking would excite the suspicions of some of the keepers, as they attempted to sally forth. The governor, however, had at this time invited a large party of friends to dine with him. Just as the dinner was about to be served up, and the guests to take their places at the table, the cook happened to go out of the kitchen and leave the door open, when the dog entered and actually eat all the bread which had been cut and prepared for the table. And as a fresh supply could not be obtained but by sending to Gorcum, which was four miles' distance, this occasioned a delay of two hours before the company could sit down to dine. During this period the governor became so enraged at the dog, that he took down a pistol and went and shot him. Thus these two obstacles were removed, and they effected their escape on the 29th of July, 1630, being a period when there was no moon, and amid the darkness of a rainy night. The boatmen, after receiving their prisoners, moved so silently, and with such celerity, that the sound of their oars was not heard; and they bore them away unnoticed by the inmates of the castle, with the utmost rapidity.*

The intended escape of these gentlemen seems to have been known to several persons at Rotterdam; and, long before their arrival there, it was rumoured that they were advancing. This place was the stronghold of the Remonstrants, and nearly all the citizens were attached to the doctrines of Arminius. About the middle of the day, the streets began to be thronged, the bridges were crowded, and thousands were waiting to welcome them with shouts of joy, when they were finally landed amid loud demonstrations of satisfaction from the people, in front of the house of Episcopius, who gave them a hearty and joyful reception.

The fact of no measures being adopted to apprehend these ministers after their escape, proves that the persons who were in the government saw that Prince Frederick showed no signs of dissatisfaction at the event, and, therefore, however bigotedly opposed to the Arminians, they judged it proper not to attempt to recommit them to a dungeon, and they were left at large to preach among the Remonstrants. But though this people had thus obtained an increase of labourers among them, yet they had lost many of their ministers by death, and they saw the rest drooping under the weight of years, and the afflictions consequent upon the persecutions to which they had been subject, having been almost always excluded from the air and the joyous light of day, and fearing, as Sapma said, to stir a foot, nay, even to cough or breathe, lest the attention of some spy should be excited by the sound. And apprehending that ten or twelve years more would bear the greater part of them to the grave, they accordingly determined upon establishing an institution for the education of pious young men, to be trained up for the ministry, lest the doctrines which they had conscientiously embraced, and for the maintenance of which they had suffered so much, might cease to be publicly administered among them. By simultaneous and universal consent, the members of the community said, "Episcopius must be theological professor of the intended institution." Amsterdam was chosen as the place for establishing it, because Barlæus* and Vossius acted there as professors in a private seminary, the former in philosophy, the other in history. For, though they were not directly connected with the Remonstrants, yet being disposed to the doctrines of Arminius, it was thought that the students could receive instruction from them in history and philosophy, and hear, in the interim, theological lectures from Episcopius.

---

* Silence here contributed to the escape of these ministers. Clamour was instrumental to it in the case of Grevius and Prins, who, some years before, had escaped from Amsterdam. Their design being discovered by a poor idiot who was kept there, he vociferously shouted, "The Arminians are getting out! the Arminians are getting out!" But he had done this at all times, and so frequently when there was no appearance of any thing of the kind, that, in this instance, he was not taken notice of, having cried, "The wolf! the wolf!" so often before; and his noise served as a cover to that which was made in scaling the walls by ladders brought to the assistance of the prisoners by Sapma, who, himself having got out of prison by the stratagem of his wife, courageously determined to assist in releasing these ministers, in which he finally succeeded, to the great astonishment of many.

---

* Barlæus, though not connected with the Remonstrants, yet assisted them at the Synod of Dort. During the sittings of that assembly he addressed it on the persecuting counsels many of its members advanced, intimating that God would chastise those who acted upon them. Facts soon proved the correctness of his statement, for in the following year the provinces of Germany, which had deputed their divines to Dort, were actually visited with the scourge of war, and forbidden to exercise religious worship according to the forms of Protestantism. The manner in which the advocates of persecution at the Synod of Dort felt the effects of this visitation, will be seen by the statement given by Barlæus in his address to the States-General, designated *Fides Imbellis;* or, "Unresisting Faith." "Those foreign divines who were present at the Synod of Dort, and who contributed by their advice and labour toward the oppression of the Remonstrants, had themselves scarcely returned to their several habitations, before they were overtaken by Divine justice, which is the avenger of insolence and pride. The divines of the palatinate are banished from their country, and, among the rest, that leader of the synodical band, that slave in the ecclesiastical farce, Abraham Schultetus. The divines from the correspondence of Wetteraw are afflicted; those of Hesse are in mourning; the Swiss divines tremble; and the divine of Charenton,

Some years, however, elapsed before this plan was carried into execution. This arose from the opposition made on the part of the Church at Rotterdam, who had chosen Episcopius to be their minister, and were unwilling to give him up. He accordingly continued in that city till 1634. During this period he composed a course of sermons on the fifth chapter of St. Matthew's gospel. These were published, and are to be found in the collection of his sermons printed after his death. About this time, also, he was again called upon to defend the doctrines of Arminius against a person by the name of Nicholas Vedelius, who, having recently come from Geneva, thought he must prove his orthodoxy by attacking the Remonstrants; and therefore published a work entitled, *Arcana Arminianismi.* Episcopius commenced an answer to this work, but its publication was delayed till 1633, for reasons we shall subsequently state. This reply bore the following title, *Vedelius Rhapsodus.* By this designation Episcopius intended to mark the character of Vedelius' work, which was a selection of passages from the writings of the Remonstrants, without a reference to what preceded or followed them; and by stringing or tacking these together, he designed to exhibit the Remonstrants in a ridiculous and heretical light. It was in allusion to this that Episcopius designated him *Rhapsodus*, that is, *the patcher*, or *cobbler*. But before he had finished this work, his attention was directed to a publication of Triglandius. This

---

[Peter du Moulin,] who, in his recent *Anatomy*, poured forth the torrents of his rage against the banished Remonstrants, is himself compelled to consult the safety of his own life in flight. God forbid that the public enemies of our country should hereafter repay, in equal measure, to the Contra-Remonstrants, the same injurious treatment which the Remonstrants have experienced from those domestic foes, and which they continue daily to experience! It is a proverb among the followers of Pythagoras, *He who endures the same degree of pain as he has previously inflicted on another, is treated with equitable retribution.*"

man, aware of the influence of Poppius' name, published some sermons under the title of *The Power of Religion*, for the purpose of destroying the effect of an important work written by the latter, and entitled, *De Enge Porte*; or, *The Strait Gate.* In these sermons he called in question the evangelical character of Poppius' book. Episcopius, anxious to assert and prove the orthodoxy of this departed holy man, instantly replied to Triglandius' work in a publication bearing the following title: *The Weakness of the Religion or Piety of James Triglandius, as presented in his Sermons against The Strait Gate of Edward Poppius.* The combat was kept up between these polemics for some time, in which they each wrote three other pamphlets on the subject, when the controversy ended.

Episcopius' admitted talents, scholarship, and profound researches as a theologian, induced individuals who were not of his communion to consult him upon important and difficult points of theology. Hence we find even in Dort, where he had some years before been condemned as a heretic, that a celebrated and learned physician, by the name of Beverwick, who was also one of the senators of the city, addressed a long and learned letter to him, requesting his opinion upon the following question, *Whether human life, as to the period of its termination, is the result of preordination or contingency?* To this question Episcopius, in the year 1632, replied in a very elaborate epistle. Before taking his departure from Rotterdam, he published a work against Popery, which he designated, *The True Antiquity of Seven Propositions or Articles.* To this he prefixed, as a preface, a small writing which he had before published under the following title, *The Labyrinth or Popish Circle.**

Having finished this work, he felt an inclination to attack our countryman, Dr. Twisse, who was eminent among the Calvinists of his day, and prolocutor of the Westminster assembly of divines. Episcopius was anxious to engage in this task from his love to the memory of his late amiable master, Arminius. This he stated in a letter to Uitenbogaerdt, saying, "I feel a strong desire to refute the subtleties of Twisse,* and diminish the credit of that man in England, and vindicate, at the same time, the fair fame of our Arminius." Uitenbogaerdt was delighted with this proposal, and instantly wrote a reply to Episcopius' letter, in which he not merely expressed his approval of his design, but urged him instantly to execute it, if his various occupations would permit. But, according to Limborch, however intent upon it, his numerous engagements prevented him from accomplishing his purpose.

---

* The late distinguished Richard Watson translated this tract, which deserves a more extended circulation than it has obtained.

Matters being now arranged for the establishment of the *Theological Institution* among the Remonstrants, Episcopius left Rotterdam in 1634, to act as divinity professor in that seminary. Here he delivered a course of lectures to the students, which were published after his death, under the title of *Theological Institutes*.† In this work he not only proposed to investigate the truth of every Christian doctrine, but also to ascertain its importance. This he did with the design of preparing the way for exhibiting the common ground on which the peace and unity of the Christian Church might be founded, Theologians in general are accustomed to hold it to be sufficient to demonstrate the truth of their doctrines, and prove the falsehood or heterodoxy of others, merely for the purpose of showing why they ought to separate from the parties whose opinions do not accord with their own. Episcopius thought differently, and asserted that it was possible for divines and Christians to have diversity of opinion, and yet hold Church fellowship, or, at least, to cultivate friendly intercourse with each other. This he attempted to prove by showing that the points debated among orthodox Christians were not such as to place the party who maintained an opinion opposite to the other in a situation that might endanger his safety; but, on the contrary, holding and publicly confessing all the great points of truth necessary to salvation, they were bound by the dictates of Christianity to cherish principles of concord and brotherly affection.

---

* Dr. Twisse was undoubtedly a man of powerful intellect, which he used in defence of Calvinism in its most rigid forms, and inveighed against his sublapsarian brethren, who wished to soften down the *decretum horribile*. With him every thing in the Divine government was resolved into the absolute will of God, and he did not scruple to say, according to his biographer, "that God, by his absolute power, had he not appointed otherwise, could have forgiven sin without satisfaction." Many divines of the Synod of Dort adopted similar sentiments. "What a horrid outcry would have been raised," says Mr. Nichols, "had any famous Arminian divine at that juncture propounded such a sentiment!" And yet these are the men who designated the Remonstrants Socinians. The reader will judge which of the two parties approached nearest the sentiments of Socinus on this point. But with the Calvinists of that day the whole of the Gospel was found in the *decretum horribile*, and he that did not advocate it was a Socinian, a libertine, an atheist.

† Here, perhaps, it will be necessary that we should say that these Theological Institutes, so justly lauded by Limborch, have been animadverted upon by Bishop Bull. The parts he has freely censured are those in which the author treats of the filiation of the Son of God. Episcopius, desiring to narrow the grounds of disunion among Christians, while avowing himself a believer in the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God,* nevertheless asserts that those who maintain the Divinity of Jesus Christ, yet declare that neither the mode of his filiation, nor the requirement of a belief in that mode, is so distinctly revealed in Scripture as to demand a decided avowal of them, do not thereby forfeit their claim to Church communion. Whether Episcopius was right or wrong in such a statement, we are not now discussing; but while he de-

* This will be seen by turning to the third chapter of the Confession, which treats of the holy Trinity.

So intent was Episcopius upon promoting the spirit of friendship and union among Christians, that in composing this work he never lost sight of this object. In endeavouring to effect this, he first examined a doctrinal point, to determine its character. This prepared the way for him to show how far there must be an agreement of opinion upon it, in order to maintain unity and fellowship; and, by consequence, to what extent diversity of sentiment might be allowed before the great bonds of unity should be broken down, and a person pronounced unsuitable for Christian communion. It was his design to bring to this trial every doctrinal subject, in order to show that all those who separated from the Church of Rome, and maintained orthodox principles, might agree

clared his belief in the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God, we feel it right to say that we think great injustice was done to him by Bishop Bull, in charging him with Socinianism, for having said that those who did not believe that the mode of filiation and the required belief of it are revealed in Scripture, were worthy of being members of a Christian community. The subject referred to is to be found in his Institutes, book iv, sec. ii, chap. 34.

upon the great and weighty doctrines of our common Christianity.

It is greatly to be wished, says Limborch, that this valuable and useful work, the like of which the Church of Christ had never seen before, had been completed according to the original design of the author. But it pleased the Lord, before this his faithful and devoted servant had executed one half of the task he had thus assigned to himself, and while he was yet treating of the prophetical office of Christ, to remove him to the eternal blessedness of heaven. He also pursued the same subject, but in a more comprehensive way, in a course of sermons on these words of our Lord, *This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* This work also closed with his remarks on the prophetical office of Christ. Beside the generally adopted mode of conveying instruction to the students by lectures, he allowed them by turn to propose certain questions to him on the most important topics of religion, or on passages of Scripture which to them appeared difficult to be understood, when he gave his interpretation of them. His answers to these questions amounted to sixty-four.

Though thus publicly occupied by the duties of his professorship, he was frequently called upon to write in defence of the cause of Arminianism. A small publication was issued from the press at this time, designated *A Remonstrant Theologian.* The picture of this supposed character was taken from the writings of Vedelius, whom we have just named as defaming the Remonstrants by misquoting and misstating their writings. To this work Episcopius wrote an answer, which he called, *The True Remonstrant Theologian.*

The Arminian Church at Rotterdam, feeling the loss of Episcopius' pulpit labours by his removal to Amsterdam, now made a strong effort to enjoy his ministry again; and it was only by the persuasions of the leading persons of their community, both clergy and laity, who proved that it was for the interest of the whole body that he should reside at Amsterdam, that they were induced to give up all claim upon him.

In the month of August, 1640, Episcopius and his lady paid a visit to Rotterdam. On their way thither he was attacked with a fever. A storm of thunder and lightning likewise came on, which prevented their reaching Rotterdam before the gates of the city were shut. Having to wait some length of time before they could gain admittance, the fever was aggravated, in consequence of which he was confined to his bed for four months, and his life was despaired of. By the special kindness of God, however, says Limborch, he was restored, and went back to Amsterdam. But in the February following the fever returned, and though he recovered, yet he felt the effects of these attacks to the latest hour of his life.

The same year, two nephews of Episcopius' wife, who resided in Rotterdam, showed some inclination to go over to the Romish Church. These gentlemen were supposed to be influenced by motives of personal interest, arising from the precarious tenure by which they held some property, and they judged that they might secure it more effectually by embracing Popery. To justify a secession from Protestantism, they presented Episcopius with ten questions, which were designated *The Ten Horns of Popery*. These contained certain propositions, after the manner of the dilemma or cornuted argument. Episcopius directly answered them; and then on his own replies formed similar propositions, which he designated *Retorsiones*, in defence of Protestantism, to be answered by the Papist. This work was afterward published, and is a masterly performance.

The same year, 1641, Episcopius had the misfortune to lose his beloved wife, Maria Jans Pesser, after a painful illness of a few days. The loss of this amiable and pious lady, with whom he had lived in the bonds of sweetest affection, was acutely felt by him. Nevertheless, by devout resignation to the Divine will, he was enabled to bear up under it, and shortly after resumed the various duties of his office with unabated zeal and diligence. He had now in hand his last work, being *An Answer to the Examination of Abraham Heidanus, of the Institutions of the Christian Religion, according to the Confession of the Remonstrants*. This writing was sent to the press in September, 1642. But before it was printed he was attacked by a dangerous illness, which rendered him incapable of composing a preface, intended as an answer to Heidanus'

Address to the Remonstrants. This, however, was supplied by Uitenbogaerdt, and prefixed to Episcopius' publication. Just as it came before the public, he was attacked by a detention of urine, which was attended with most alarming symptoms; and though he twice obtained partial relief, yet it finally terminated in his death. The progress of the disease is minutely given by Limborch, in his memoirs; but we deem it necessary only to say that he fell into a state of stupor, and was for some time totally deprived of sight. Of this heavy affliction, however, he seemed generally to be unconscious, in consequence of the stupor to which he was subject; but though he was thus prevented from feeling this calamity to the full extent which he otherwise would have done, yet when he was in any measure relieved from this insensibility, and his understanding was more active, then he adverted to his blindness to his friends, saying that in the future he should not be able, as heretofore, to labour for the benefit of the Church, and for the Lord Jesus Christ, his heavenly Master. During this painful and distressing affliction, the whole of the words and sentiments he uttered were marked by deep piety and unshaken confidence in Jesus Christ, his Divine Saviour and Redeemer. At length his disease assumed an aspect which took away all hope of his recovery, and the signs of dissolution became more and more evident, until, on the 4th of April, 1643, he piously and calmly fell asleep in Jesus, having attained the age of sixty years and three months. At the period of his decease the moon was under an eclipse, which led some of his friends to remark that the event then taking place in the natural world, was a just picture of that which had transpired in the literary and moral world, inasmuch as death had thus partially obscured the brightness of a luminary whose light, borrowed from Christ the Sun of righteousness, would remain shaded till the morning of the resurrection; nevertheless, that the other part still continued illumined, since his works remained to shine forth in all their brightness, dispelling darkness and exhibiting a pathway to the inquirer after truth and holiness.

It was determined that Episcopius' remains should be interred on the fourth day after his decease; and he was accordingly buried in the Western church beside his wife.

Uitenbogaerdt, though in his eighty-seventh year, and at some distance from Amsterdam, yet impelled by his affectionate remembrance of the man who had been his bosom friend and inseparable companion in exile, now hastened to be present on the mournful occasion of his funeral. Arriving there the day before, and being conducted to the room where the body was laid, he approached the coffin, and placing his hand upon the head of the corpse, he exclaimed, with great emotion, "O head! head! how much of wisdom was once contained in thee!" Of all the persons who followed Episcopius to the tomb, and these were very numerous, none more sincerely and affectionately mourned his loss than this distinguished and aged minister. Grotius, as soon as he heard of the death of his friend, immediately wrote from Paris to his brother, who resided at the Hague, saying, among other things, in relation to the deceased, "I am deeply distressed by the news of the death of Episcopius: it is an event that will be severely felt by the Remonstrants. He was alike distinguished for his extraordinary intellect, his powerful eloquence, and the spotless purity of his life."

To commemorate the worth of this distinguished man, his relations had a medal struck. On the one side of it was the image of Truth, on the reverse that of Liberty. By these emblems they intended to show that he had been the powerful and eloquent defender of both. His manuscripts, says Limborch, he assigned to my father, Francis Van Limborch, and named, at the same time, Peter Cupus, Bartholomew Prævostius, and John Polyander, Remonstrant ministers, to act in conjunction with him in inspecting and preparing them for publication.

CHAPTER XVIII.

HITHERTO we have made use of Limborch's memoirs of Episcopius only as a book of reference. This chapter, however, which exhibits a portrait of his character, both as to his intellectual eminence and moral worth, we beg leave to inform the reader, is a free translation from the above writer.

In commencing his description of this great man, he says,—Having thus given a brief account of the course of Episcopius' life, and the ceaseless and unwearied labours in which he was engaged to the very close of his career, in the discharge of those duties which devolved upon him as a minister of the Church, and a faithful servant of our Lord Jesus Christ, it now remains that we enter a little closer into an examination of his character, in order that we may, as far as possible, present the reader with an exhibition of the extraordinary powers of his understanding, and the other rare endowments with which he was distinguished. And although it is possible to form a tolerably correct estimate of them from what has already been stated, and more especially from a careful perusal of his writings in which they shine forth in a most splendid manner, nevertheless it may be worth an effort to attempt to portray a more distinct representation of them.

In doing this, it may be fearlessly stated that he was a man of clear and vigorous understanding, sagacious and accurate judgment, indefatigable diligence, extraordinary learning, powerful eloquence, exemplary piety, undaunted courage, unimpeachable fidelity, and unflinching constancy under suffering. This rare combination of natural and acquired capabilities appeared in him to the greatest advantage, chiefly from his possessing a frank and cheerful temper, accompanied with modesty, courtesy, and affability of manners. He knew how to accommodate himself to the dispositions and circumstances of others, but especially to meet the condition of those who were lower in the scale of mind and learning than himself, so as to excite their confidence and esteem.

Were we disposed to attempt to demonstrate the truth of this statement in any, or all its parts, we think that the history of his life and the character of his writings would furnish ample means for effecting such an object. But we deem it not necessary to attempt any thing like an extended or elaborate vindication of the portrait we have just given. Indeed, the strength of his understanding, and the extent of his learning, were so eminently extraordinary, and so generally admitted, as to render any attempt to prove them perfectly superfluous. The Remonstrants considered him to be, and held him up to public notice, as the principal champion and defender of their doctrines; and especially rejoiced in him as the great advocate of toleration, of which they account themselves not merely the avowed supporters, but leaders in such a holy cause. The venerable Uitenbogaerdt, whose extraordinary powers are known to every one, has frequently declared to the relations of Episcopius "that he had, during his protracted life, conversed with very many learned men, but that he had never met with any theologian who was to be compared with Episcopius for his knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and Divine subjects;" and he was accustomed to add "that he did not make such a statement for the purpose of gratifying his relatives, but as the result of a deep conviction of the truth of his assertion, and as being due to the memory of such a man."

In what esteem his works are held in England at this day is well known to all the world, seeing that the writings of the most eminent and learned men of that country show how much their authors have been indebted to him. Even his greatest enemies have been constrained to acknowledge the superiority and splendour of his talents. Heidanus, in his *Causa Dei*, admits "that the following accomplishments were conspicuous in him; viz., great learning, penetration, eloquence, and skill;" and these he possessed in such a high degree that, had he used them in defence of the doctrines maintained by Heidanus, in the same manner as he had wielded them against them, "he would have acquired a high reputation, and have been esteemed and honoured as one of the most distinguished doctors of the age."

Francis Burman, formerly professor in Utrecht, in the second part of his Synopsis of Theology, gives the following testimony in his favour:—"Among the Remonstrants Episcopius must be placed before all others, as being their great chief and leader, who laudably refuted the errors both of the Jews and Papists. His other works, it is true, must be read with judgment and discretion." The editors of the works of the celebrated Andrew Rivet affixed no other preface to them than an encomium which Episcopius passed upon them in a letter to the Heer Beverwick, who subsequently showed it to Rivet—proving most decidedly the estimation in which they held the judgment and learning of this extraordinary man. By many members of the Romish Church his learning and talents were held in such high regard that, although he had attacked the doctrines of Popery in the most powerful manner, they have, nevertheless, spoken of his writings in the strongest terms of approval. This has been especially the case with Father Mabillon, who, at this time, says Limborch, enjoys in France, in consequence of his writings, a high degree of esteem and consideration. In speaking of Episcopius' Institutes, he bears the following favourable testimony to them:—"I cannot forbear saying in this place that, if some parts of the Theological Institutes of Episcopius were expunged, they might be used with great advantage in the study of divinity. The work is divided into four books, the order of which is totally different from that of similar works which are at this day in common use. His style is elegant, the mode of treating his subjects justly corresponds with his style, and the time would not be ill spent by any one in perusing the work, if certain parts of it were omitted in which he speaks against the Catholics in defence of his own sect. Grotius so highly valued these Institutes, that he constantly carried them about with him." In this statement, says Limborch, Mabillon is under a great mistake, for not only is this work too large be carried about, but it was actually not published till five years after the death of Grotius.

In support of the correctness of these encomiums, we may venture to assert that he who is in the least degree acquainted with the works of this learned divine must have discovered, and be forced to admit, that on opening to any part of his writings, on whatever subject he may happen to fix his eye, there he will at once perceive that all those powers which have been attributed to him, shine forth with the brightest lustre. If the reader, for instance, will turn to any of his treatises on any branch of theology, and carefully and impartially examine it, he will find that he has not only accurately distinguished all the parts of the subject, and given a clear and luminous exhibition of the point immediately under consideration, but has so completely and fully investigated it, that he will be constrained to acknowledge that justice has been done to the subject, and actually nothing is left to be said upon it.

In vindicating his own sentiments, and refuting those to which he was opposed, he did not use his arguments without discrimination; a practice too common among theologians. But he first maturely examined the force of those usually adopted by others on any particular topic, or such as originated in his own mind, and then availed himself of the most weighty and conclusive, judging that the solidity of any proof does not consist in the number, but in the strength, of the arguments adduced in its support; and that it is not unfrequently the case, that truth itself is injured by the insufficient attempts by which some persons endeavour to overthrow an adversary, inasmuch as when the latter can readily refute the imbecile reasoning brought against him, he is the more fully confirmed in his attachment to his errors, and becomes more self-confident from the apparent victory he has gained, and arrives at the conclusion that no more solid proofs can be adduced in favour of the theory he has opposed, otherwise they would have been advanced by his antagonist.

In judging of his capabilities as a commentator, let but the impartial student turn to any of his expositions of Scripture, but especially his illustrations of some of those parts of holy writ considered to be very obscure and difficult to be understood, and he must acknowledge that in his attempts to throw light upon them, he has not only displayed the energies of a great mind, but has done whatever could be required of a sound and faithful interpreter. For instance, he most diligently and above all things laboured to ascertain what was the particular design of the sacred writer himself. In accomplishing this, he critically and closely examined the style of the author, determined the strict import of a passage in the original, and then adopted that interpretation the least forced, and which seemed most naturally to accord with the whole current of the subject. Moreover, he was accustomed to support his explanations by various weighty arguments, and in this manner either won over to his sentiments the attentive and unbiassed reader, or, at least, convinced him that his exposition bore upon it the strongest marks of truth. Here I may say, without fearing contradiction, that he has done more than most theologians in establishing certain principles of interpretation, which, if adopted by the sincere inquirer after truth, will be found to assist him greatly in his attempts to investigate and elucidate the sacred Scriptures.

Some persons have attempted to call in question the high claims of Episcopius to scholarship, on the alleged ground of his not being deeply read in ecclesiastical history, and that class of writers usually denominated the fathers of the Church.* I am free to acknowledge that he certainly did not pay so much deference, either to the writings of ancient ecclesiastical historians, or the fathers of the Church, as some do, who think that a perfect knowledge of their works is sufficient to enable us to adjust and settle all disputes in matters of religion, and who maintain that, if perfect unanimity can be made to appear upon any point by quotations from their writings, in that case they may be appealed to as a sufficient rule of judgment upon any debated question in the Church of Christ. Episcopius certainly saw not this pretended utility and authority in the writings of the fathers, and thought that an attempt to seek that unanimity among them, in order to make their judgment bear upon the disputes of the present day, would certainly be an endless task, and, if accomplished, of little service, because they all were not only capable of erring, but also that no one of them had been exempt from mistake; and that nothing is to be met with in their writings in the way of enabling us correctly to interpret the Scriptures that is not to be found in the works of other writers who have lived in a later period. Besides, he was accustomed to say of the fathers, "He observed that in them there was so much that was obscure and ambiguous; that their words were frequently capable of a twofold meaning, and were often so strained, and used in such a perverted sense, and to convey such opposite ideas, that it would be endless labour to discriminate and ascertain their true intent and meaning." He then adds, "Moreover, I candidly confess that I am conscious that I have not bestowed so much time and labour in reading the early ecclesiastical historians as is required in those who deem it right to make an appeal to them in support of any opinion they may adopt and publish to the world. Whether this has originated with the circumstance of my being naturally disinclined to such reading, or through inattention to them, I really am unable to determine. This I know, that I have never been strongly disposed toward them, or, at least, I have no very great esteem for these ancient ecclesiastical historians." As to the claims of these historians, the reasons of his not holding them in the high estimation that some persons have done, he has fully stated in the commencement of his second letter to the Jesuit Waddingus, on the worship of images, in which he declares that he should not be willing to enter into a dispute with any person, if the question at issue was to be decided by an appeal to the authority and testimony of ecclesiastical historians. "My want of confidence," he says, "in the fidelity of these writers, partly arises from the conduct of some who bear that name in the present day. Let me go to our own history as a people. Although the proceedings adopted against us, and the character of the persons who have so injured our reputation, and occasioned our present exile and sufferings, are well known; yet what has not been said and written to vindicate them and defame us by persons who are called *modern historians?* Take, for instance, the case of Baudartius, whose pages are foully stained with malevolence, and who may be justly designated any thing but a historian. And what has not that foolish Hessian, Daniel Angelocrator, written, respecting the events that have taken place in Holland, in his book concerning the Synod of Dort? Nevertheless, the reader should not forget that this man was one of the *fathers* who was summoned to assist at the synod; and, consequently, had been an eye witness of all its transactions, and therefore capable, it might be said, of accurately examining and faithfully recording all its proceedings. With these circumstances before him, it would, at first sight, be deemed the highest presumption and skepticism in any one to dare to call in question the credibility of a theologian who had thus been summoned to attend the synod, and had remained some months in Holland, favoured with the company and conversation both of the divines of that country and the deputies of the States. And although his work abounds with most absurd and foolish statements, and his assertions are so grossly false that it may, with the strictest justice, be considered as only entitled to be ranked with Grecian fable; yet, with the above facts, and the advantage of the course of time, a person might take these as the ground of confidence in the veracity of this writer. And I am bold to say that after the lapse of a certain period such will be the arguments set up in its favour, and thus its fictitious statements will be quoted as exhibiting matters of real history.

---

* Bishop Bull, though he does not question Episcopius' claims to scholarship on the ground of his not being deeply read in the writings of these fathers, but, on the contrary, designates him "the very learned and ingenious Episcopius," nevertheless strongly censures him for saying to Waddingus, "You shall never engage me in the drudgery of wading through these writings. Nor do I envy those persons who vaunt themselves on their extensive acquaintance with them, and the histories of the proceedings of councils."—*Bishop Bull's Works*, vol. ii, p. 105.

"When I consider the above case, and others of a similar kind, I am inevitably led to this conclusion, that I have a right to doubt whether the facts and events said to have taken place in ancient times did exist, and especially in the manner in which they are represented, in relation to those to whom they have been attributed. My mind thus being held in doubt as to the testimony of these writers, I can never, therefore, bring myself to that degree of acquiescence in their statements as to allow myself to be convicted of their truth, or appeal to them for the purpose of convincing another, especially when the historian is a party concerned. For it is almost impossible for such a person not to be carried away, or mix his feelings with his narrative; and, as a consequence, he will too highly colour or deeply shade the facts he has to state. Indeed, all history may be justly suspected, unless the historian be a neutral person, and altogether uninterested and unaffected by the subject of which he writes, it being with him a matter of perfect indifference, whether he has to state a certain case, or directly the opposite."

In our portrait of Episcopius, we should not do justice to him, if we did not exhibit his love of peace as a prominent feature in his character. This disposition, in fact, is evident throughout the whole of his writings. Claiming, it is true, the privilege of forming his own opinion on any subject, he freely granted the same right unto others, never wishing to compel a person to adopt his sentiments; and when unable by the force of argument to win an individual to his views, he was ever ready to evince a brotherly spirit of forbearance, in tolerating in him what he deemed to be an erroneous sentiment. With him this toleration was based upon those principles which ought to be cultivated by all Protestants; namely, that all that was necessary to be believed and performed, in order to the salvation of any person, is fully revealed in the sacred Scriptures, as being the only infallible rule of faith and conduct, delivered to us by God, and Jesus Christ, the only supreme legislator. Any points, therefore, not fully and expressly declared in the Scriptures as being absolutely necessary to be believed, in order to any one living in holiness and dying in safety, he never attempted at any time to impose upon a man as an article of faith absolutely necessary to be believed and adopted. On the other hand, that which the Scripture distinctly and expressly condemned as erroneous, he never for a moment allowed that it ought to be tolerated, or admitted that those who maintained such doctrines should be received into the bosom of the Church, or share in the privilege of Christian brotherhood. Nevertheless, having gone thus far in relation to such persons, he believed he was not warranted either to take upon himself, or vindicate in others, any severer line of conduct against them. So judging, he maintained that he acted in accordance with the instructions of Jesus Christ, his Lord and Master, to whom alone he said it belonged, as supreme teacher and lawgiver in his Church, to institute penalties and exercise the right of adjudging men to eternal life or eternal death; and that he who took upon himself to impose upon others more than the Divine Saviour had stated in his holy word as necessary to salvation, arrogantly assumed his authority, and presumptuously mounted his judgment seat.

This point was deemed by him of such moment, that he considered the maintenance of it of more importance than his own views on any particular subject connected with the doctrine of predestination, in vindication of which he wrote so many learned treatises. This he most expressly states in a letter to Hugo Grotius: "My affection for the holy cause of our society," he says, "is greater than my ability to serve it. For I am fully persuaded that there is no religious body which advocates and applies remedies so calculated to heal the dissensions and schisms which rend and tear the Christian world, as does our community. I should not esteem the dispute on the five articles of that degree of importance that I do, were it not connected with the discrimination between essential and unessential points of doctrine, and of the mutual toleration of Christians. I know that there are persons who think otherwise, and regard them only for their own sake, and therefore believe that they must rigidly and *αποτομως strictly* confine themselves within the five articles. But I cannot bring myself in this matter to their judgment. Not that I think that any thing ought to be agitated which the Christian world has hitherto wished should remain untouched—by no means. On the contrary, I so love Christian peace and unity, that I would rather conceal my views on any unimportant truth than seek to obtain a species of vain glory from an exhibition of them, though they might appear to me to be a discovery. And I do this because I think that little will be effected in the way of securing this unity, until all disputes upon minor points be in a similar manner avoided, and whatever would contribute to their attendants,—dissensions, separations, schisms, persecutions. And this I judge will never be accomplished, until an accurate discrimination be made between necessary and unnecessary truths. To contend earnestly for an unnecessary truth, as though it were an important point of doctrine, is a line of conduct I shall never adopt. For, in my judgment, it is better to err concerning a truth which is not essential, than so to misuse our correct views of it as to make it an occasion of dissension and odium. Error is not the work of the flesh, but schism is the mother and nurse of hatred and faction, and consequently of persecution. I believe, therefore, that to draw a line of distinction between essential and unessential truths, and to promote unity and peace among Christians, should be the end and object of all our labours and writings, and that to which every thing else ought to be subservient. And I am fully convinced that this design is so well pleasing to the most high God, that on account of it he will accompany our society with his blessing, though the whole world should rise to oppose it."

In consequence of his moderation and love of peace, he was charged with Socinianism, and it was publicly reported that he was attached to that heresy. This grew out of the prevailing notion, that for a person soundly to embrace doctrines opposite to those of Socinus, it was necessary for him to prove his orthodoxy by condemning and denouncing the followers of this man to everlasting perdition. The incorrectness and injustice of such a mode of judging, Abraham Calovius, formerly professor of Wurtemburg, clearly saw and stated. For although he was as great an enemy to the toleration advocated by the Arminians, as any among the Calvinists, yet, when adverting to the character of Episcopius, he thus writes: "Voetius intimates that he has no doubt that Episcopius ought to be declared guilty of the Socinian errors. But Vedelius,* not satisfied with this, openly asserts that among the Arminians Episcopius must be considered not only a Socinian, but as having been wholly nourished and cherished by the milk of Socinianism, and that he has it even in the marrow of his bones. But," says Calovius, "in the writings of Episcopius the contrary appears most evidently and distinctly. For in them he not only defends the doctrine of the Trinity in a most masterly way, but also the pre-existence of the Son of God before his assumption of humanity, and clearly demonstrates his Divine nature against Socinus, and ably refutes at the same time his subtle reasonings and cavillings. This may be seen in his Theological Institutes, book iv, chap. 32. And although all that he there teaches concerning the Trinity may not be deemed strictly in accordance with the Catholic faith, as we shall show in its proper place, nevertheless, what he there states most distinctly proves him not to have been a Socinian, but demonstrates, on the contrary, that he was decidedly opposed to the doctrines of that school. On this account, therefore, it is not safe to give credit to the charges of the Calvinists alone, unless the opposite party, that is, the Remonstrants, be heard, and their opinion fairly and honestly taken out of their writings."

---

* The reader will recollect that this was *Rhapsodus, the patcher.* See page 421.

To the above statement Limborch adds, that so far from his being a Socinian, I dare assert that Episcopius, both by his moderation and powerful arguments, has won more persons from Socinianism than the whole of the Calvinistic writers. This arises from their generally attacking this system with weak arguments, and thereby rendering the parties whom they assail the more confirmed in their errors. In vindication of this statement I shall relate the following fact.

While Episcopius was professor at Leyden, Jonas Slichtingius and Martin Ruarus spent some time at this university. During their stay there, Episcopius had several conversations with them on different doctrines of religion, and more especially on the efficacy of the death of Christ. In one of these he stated the sentiments of the Remonstrants on this subject, which may be considered as a medium between those of the Calvinists and the Socinians. The Contra-Remonstrants assert that Christ has taken upon himself all the sins of the elect, and has suffered for them all the punishment that their offences had merited, and therefore was literally and strictly punished in their stead, and thus satisfied the punitive justice of God. Socinus, on the contrary, believed that Christ's death merely sealed and confirmed his doctrine, and that he, having risen from the dead and ascended into heaven, was exalted to be king over all men, and received all might in heaven and earth, and through this power sends his word into all the world, by the influence of which he converts men, and, as the king over all, pardons the sins of those who are converted by it, and thus reconciles them unto God the Father. The sentiments of the Remonstrants may be thus stated, that Christ, through his painful and ignominious death, which he innocently suffered, satisfied the will of God, which was at once just and merciful; that is, that he readily obeyed God, and suffered all that God would he should suffer to atone for the sins of the whole human race; and also that his death was a real and efficient sin-offering and propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, on which account the wrath of God against sinners is appeased. Therefore God has instituted a new covenant with men, in which he declares that he will graciously and freely forgive them all actual sins and guilt, and bestow upon them eternal life, on the condition that they believe on his Son Jesus Christ, and obey his holy Gospel. And while the gracious overtures of this Gospel are being preached, God mercifully restrains his anger, and patiently waits their conversion.* This sentiment, which stands midway between the other two, was communicated from Episcopius to Grotius through Vossius, when the latter asked him his opinion of Grotius' book on the satisfaction of Christ. The above statement of his sentiments Episcopius so powerfully supported by testimonies drawn from Scripture, that Slichtingius and Ruarus, being fully convinced of its truth, adopted his views on this point, and in various parts of their writings showed that they were the advocates of the doctrines of the Remonstrants.†

---

* Although the Holy Spirit is not here adverted to as accompanying the preaching of the Gospel, to give efficiency to it in the conversion of a sinner, yet this was fully believed and publicly maintained by Episcopius in his writings and sermons. Many quotations might be produced in favour of this statement. We, however, shall give but one, which is to be found in his answer to Cameron's defence; it is as follows: "Si actionem intelligas per quam mens capax redditur ad percipiendum dogmata Christianæ religionis, eaque certo credendum, non potes sane ignorari, quin Remonstrantes ejusmodi actionem Sancti Spiritus in mentem semper admiserint, et potentiam ad credendam necessarjam semper concesserint."

In the folio edition of his sermons published in Dutch, he has a course of sermons on the agency of the Spirit, in which he speaks of its varied operations in the awakening and conversion of a sinner, and its attesting pardon and adoption to the believer's heart, with the necessity of its influence in order to his sanctification and perseverance in holiness to the end of his life.

† Of these gentlemen we know nothing, save from their works. Slichtingius, however, it appears, was a Polish knight. In his defence against the synods of South and North Holland, who charged him with being a Socinian, he declares himself to be a believer in

His love of peace was accompanied with a modest and inoffensive freedom, which was especially evident when he stated his sentiments to others, which he proposed for their edification, as well as to receive their candid strictures upon them. The liberty he required for himself, he readily conceded to others, and what he considered too much for another to claim from him, he never exacted for himself. In him was seen the love of independence with the exercise of forbearance, and he embodied in his conduct, more than is usual with most persons, that maxim, which required him to do unto others that which he wished them to do unto him; consequently, what he desired them not to do unto him he guarded against doing to them. Such a temper of mind, and mode of acting, prepared him to allow another to differ from him, and prevented his treating the party who did so otherwise than with the utmost kindness and courtesy. We have already hinted at his disposition to accommodate himself to persons of limited mind and education. This, we conceive, principally originated with that solicitude which prompted him to adopt the most suitable means to give them distinct views upon any doctrine, and thereby bring them to a knowledge of the truth. Of the correctness of this statement, all those who were acquainted with him, and were favoured with his friendship, were ready to testify.

It is true, I am quite aware that some persons have said that Episcopius did not show much amiableness of temper in his writings; but, on the contrary, displayed a

---

the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of satisfaction by the atonement.

Ruarus made similar declarations also in several of his writings; still he was charged with being a Socinian. It is impossible for us to say whether he was such or otherwise, because it was a common practice with the Calvinists, when a man demurred at the absolute decrees of election and reprobation, to brand him with being a heretic, as Moulin charged Amyraut with being an Arian, in consequence of his advocating his milder views of Calvinism, to which we shall subsequently advert. The above statement on the atonement, said to exhibit the views of Episcopius on this subject, we beg leave to remind the reader, is only a second hand representation of his sentiments, and, indeed, may be considered rather as giving those of Limborch than of Episcopius, and we prefer directing the reader to the chapter on the *work of redemption* in the Confession, for Episcopius' opinions on this important subject.

great share of keenness and asperity of feeling toward those against whom he wrote. I must, however, take the liberty of saying that they are made by those individuals who, above all others, ought to be the last to give utterance to such complaints, and from whose lips they come without the least shadow of justice or propriety. For instance, the Apology he wrote against the Leyden censurers of the Confession, and his writings against Heidanus and Vedelius, have been complained of by these gentlemen. But suppose it be granted that Episcopius might have replied to them in milder terms than he did, yet are these the persons who have a right to murmur because he did not? That Episcopius, when he was attacked, certainly rose in all the might of his energies, to defend himself and the good cause of the Remonstrants against an adversary, is readily admitted; nevertheless, it is to be understood that he was never, or rarely, the assailant; and when engaged in repelling the charges of an opponent, let any person only compare the writings penned against him, and his answers to them, and then, candidly and without prejudice, give a decision in the case; and we know who he will be constrained to say exhibited the greatest share of bitterness and severity in his writings. These men have shown, in their publications, that it was not their object to instruct, but to occasion the Arminians to be hated and suspected of heresy, and in this manner excite a spirit of opposition and persecution against them. They not only condemned all their doctrines as pernicious errors, but likewise evinced unabating hostility to them in all their measures and proceedings.

One odious and leading feature in all their works Episcopius strongly censured; that is, their presumption in daring to condemn others, and showed how repugnant their mode of judging and acting was to the gentle temper of Jesus Christ and his holy Gospel. Such conduct, be it understood, is not a mere error of the understanding, but a sin worthy of punishment, and that too of the heaviest kind, because of its being clothed with a specious appearance of zeal for the truth of God. In order, therefore, to act the part of an upright defender of Christian peace and liberty, he could not do otherwise than vividly paint and exhibit such a sin in all its deception and deformity, and pronounce upon it its justly merited condemnation. We may here be permitted to remind the reader that, while contemplating the conduct of Episcopius in reproving his antagonists, he ought always to remember not merely the severity that was adopted against him and his brethren, but the sheer malignity with which they were pursued, manifested by their enemies in branding them with odious epithets, and attributing to them the most revolting heresies, which was done evidently with a design of bringing persecution upon them, inasmuch as such representations were followed with an appeal to the civil authorities to punish them as being heterodox in their sentiments. And we farther challenge the reader to point out a single instance of retaliation on his part, in the same abusive language and foul reproaches with which he was assailed. That he used strong rebukes will be admitted, but never without showing that his enemies had furnished him with just occasion for them. And we defy any one to find in his writings an instance in which he designates his opponents *heretics* and *covenant breakers*, or that he has ever been known to pass a rash and uncharitable judgment upon their motives, and the purposes and feelings of their hearts. Neither, indeed, did he ever act the part of the Contra-Remonstrants, who constantly and positively asserted that when the Arminians came forth, in the first instance, to announce certain doctrines, they did so, not from a conviction of their truth, but from a desire of the vain glory attendant on the publication of that which is novel. And thus they insinuated that they wrote and defended opinions which in their consciences they admitted to be false, till at length they were brought by the necessity of their circumstances to contend for their verity, and at last were led to believe them to be true as a consequence of judicial blindness. This presumption, which claimed the right of judging of the feelings and motives of the heart of another, and mounting the judgment seat of God, never once entered the gentle and unassuming mind of Episcopius. Those who are prepared to esteem and vindicate the publications to which he so ably replied, I cannot see with what degree of justice they can complain of the severity which may have been occasionally used by him. Every person knows how ready the Contra-Remonstrant doctors are to apologize for the bitterness Calvin and Beza have exhibited in their writings, but especially for the severity and cruelly persecuting conduct of the former. Hence the professor, Heidanus, in adopting this line of conduct, says, "Few persons were made subject to the effects of Calvin's anger, but those who merited it. Irritability seems natural to great minds which are intent upon the accomplishment of their designs, and it is by no means proper in us to reproach or ridicule them on account of it. We can indeed be angry, and sin not. Anger excited on account of God's glory, in vindication of the truth, is becoming to great minds." Let, says Limborch, but a small portion of the indulgence which is thus shown to the name and violent temper of Calvin,* be exercised toward Episcopius, and then such persons will not only find no occasion of reproach against him, but be compelled to pronounce a eulogy upon his lenity and gentleness.

Some charge him with treating sacred subjects with levity. I aver that this allegation is perfectly unfounded, and dare challenge any person to produce an instance in which he treats sacred subjects or religious truths in an unbecoming manner. He may, perhaps, have freely rebuked or treated with pleasantry the foolish claims of some writers, who have assumed the right of lording over other men's consciences, and with an air of self-consequence intimated that they were qualified to set up a standard of faith, and dogmatically condemned those who dared to question their competency for such a work, while they evinced at the time all but the most perfect ignorance of theology. And if men will call the administering of just, though cutting rebukes, jesting, then, indeed, it may be said that he manifested it in the highest degree against the presumption and audacity of such individuals. But I maintain that he was far from treating with levity any subjects really appertaining to religion; but, on the contrary, he was accustomed to speak and write of them in the most serious and reverential manner. The reasons which induced Episcopius occasionally to adopt a severe style, he stated in a letter to Caspar Barlæus, in which he said, "Most of the brethren were of opinion that the Apology for the Confession should have a degree of mustard and caustic in it, and at length I was brought to the same opinion, although, as you well know, such a mode of writing is in direct opposition to my temper and feelings. *Censendi illa impetigo defricanda videbatur salis alicujus aspersione.* And since it is everywhere apparent in this work of these censurers, that they did not intend to inform or instruct us better in the truth; but, on the contrary, that they might render us odious and suspected by misrepresentations, in order that we might become the victims of general hatred, it was therefore thought that we should use our liberty of speech, and not spare men who had manifested so little of the spirit of Christianity, but should hold up to public ridicule their ignorance in disputing, as well as their rashness in censuring." In a letter to the learned Beverwick, he complains of the malignity of a certain preacher, and makes the following remarks: "I wish him to be of a better mind, and console myself with the testimony of my conscience under his calumnies. Nevertheless, I am grieved that through these reproaches the hatred of the common people is fostered and sharpened against the innocent, to the great injury both of the Church and the state. Had I not seen this, I should long since have despised all the evil speaking of the many bigoted persons who are perpetually endeavouring to injure us. On this account it is that I have been so frequently induced to attack with severity the ignorance of such malevolent and slandering persons. Not that I have pleasure in such a species of employment, but that I might take away the mask by which they impose upon and mislead weak people by their violent sermons and writings, and drive them almost to fury and madness.

---

* We are by no means disposed to insert in the pages of this work proofs of the violent temper of Calvin, as given by Chandler in his History of Persecution, when speaking of his treatment toward Castalio; but certainly the terms that he makes use of, as indicative of his anger and wrath, are tremendously fierce. "Castalio's reply to all these flowers," says Chandler, "is worthy the patience of a Christian, and from his slanderer he appeals to the righteous judgment of God." We think it right that Castalio's conduct should be imitated by other Christians on this subject, and leave Him who will do righteously to judge of such men as Calvin, who, with all their defects, have been eminently distinguished in their day, and to whom the world and the Church owe so much.

These gentlemen cannot allow any one to question their opinion, without subjecting him to their hatred; nay, if a person does not immediately receive, at their nod, every thing which has lately been adopted and taught in their schools, as authoritatively binding upon him, and that too without the least demur, they instantly require that he should be shunned with aversion, and treated as the reprobate of Heaven, and as one who is smitten by the wrath of God. Instead, however, of these things moving me to write sharply, had I followed my inclination, I should not have written at all, but remained in silence, especially when I saw that argument and reason would be lost upon those against whom I wrote."

Episcopius had the unhappiness to live in difficult and troublesome times, in which the Church was greatly agitated, and he was not only called upon to contend with error, but also against ignorance, bitterness, bigotry, tyranny, and the domineering spirit of many. Hence he was necessitated repeatedly to write upon the same subject; and it was matter of frequent and great complaint with him, that he was compelled to spend the flower of his days in controversy and debate, and that when he was anxious to engage in the study of any subject, or bend his mind to the illustration of the holy Scriptures, he was instantly called away from the execution of his purpose to assume the character of the polemic, in vindication of some important but debated doctrine. We know, says Limborch, how painful it is for a man of a peaceful disposition to be drawn away, in opposition to his feelings, from the more pleasing and useful occupations which he has marked out for himself, in order to enter upon a course of disputation. But irksome as it is, thus to be compelled to engage in conflict with error, it is still more so to be forced to contend against the propensities and conduct of men who are intent upon creating rents and schisms in the Church, and who display all the haughtiness of ecclesiastical tyranny; but that which is still more disagreeable than either is to be constrained to write again and again in reply to such persons. Under these circumstances, where is the mind that can retain perfect equanimity, or does not show on certain occasions how offensive and palling to it is the necessity it is under of repeatedly pursuing the same course of thinking and the same class of objects.

And suppose Episcopius had used a little pleasantry with the absurd and incongruous dogmas that some defended, which, however, he never did, would he be more to blame on that account than the Heer Philip de Marnix,* who, in his *Alvearium*, so openly sports and jests with the doctrines of the Papists, or than Peter du Moulin, concerning whose jestings the Papists so complained that they called him a second Rabelais? And, pray, to whom of the reformed are the jokes of these writers offensive? To none; but, on the contrary, to whom of them are they not highly pleasing? while many do not scruple publicly to express great satisfaction in perusing them. With what reason, then, have certain persons shown themselves so indignant at Episcopius, who never thus trifled and sported with the sentiments of any individual, though he justly chastised the presumption of some, and pointed out the gross views of others on sacred subjects? All that such persons can, with justice, allege against him is, that he vigorously attacked error, ignorance, and folly. Had he written on the other side of the question, then he had been reputed an incomparable man. Nay, had he only opposed the Remonstrants, or the doctrines of any people which were in opposition to those of these complainers, then his conduct would have offended none of them, although in so doing his pen had been dipped in as much gall and bitterness as was that of many of the writers among them. Yet it should be remembered that we have no right to prescribe rules for another, to which we ourselves refuse to submit when in similar circumstances; and that we should be willing to give to a man that which we expect he should concede to us. If we act thus, we shall not blame in other doctors and writers that which we praise in those of our own creed, but be ready duly to estimate that which is good, from whomsoever it may proceed. But on this subject we have said sufficient.

To all the rare endowments of Episcopius was added exemplary piety, his Christian conduct being a striking model of purity to all around him. His spirit was especially marked with deep reverence for and ardent devotedness to God. His zealous and unbending attachment to truth and the requirements of conscience was unassailable. This will appear from the circumstance that while he was yet in the flower of his age, not being more than thirty-six years old, he willingly suffered the deprivation of his office as professor of theology in the university of Leyden, the duties of which he had discharged with such great credit to himself, and preferred going into banishment, suffering the want of all the comforts of this life, and wandering as an exile in a strange and unknown land, without any apparent hope of ever returning to his *fatherland*, rather than do any thing that would stain his conscience, or be injurious to the glory of God. And what more might I not say of his courage and steadfastness, of his generosity and modesty, his affable and bland temper, of which, were I to adduce examples by an appeal to his general conduct and actions, I should enter upon a wide and immeasurable field. In a word, he lived as becomes a true Christian, who proves his faith by a holy and devoted life, and who by the grace of God has persevered in piety to the end of his days; and then, with holy confidence in Jesus Christ his Saviour, calmly and undismayed contemplates death, supported by the testimony of a good conscience, while relying upon the efficacy of the atonement and intercession of Jesus Christ his Redeemer, until finally, full of hope, and with unshaken trust, he commends his soul into the hands of God his faithful Creator, being assured that he in whom he hath believed, and to whom he has committed his spirit as a precious pledge, is able to keep it unto that day. May God grant to all of us that we may always thankfully acknowledge and praise him for the abundant grace bestowed upon his servant, whom he had distinguished with the same hope and experience; that, supported with a good conscience, we also may with him be made partakers of the resurrection of the JUST.

---

* This nobleman is more generally known by the name of Du Plessis. See page 202.

THE character of Episcopius, in its moral excellency, as thus given by Limborch, is admitted by universal testimony to be correct, and has never been assailed by any writer, excepting Monsieur Jurieu, whose warmth and impetuosity in religious controversy says Mosheim, are well known. This violent calumniator, fifty years after Episcopius' death, attempted to attack him on the score of heresy, saying that he was a Socinian, and an enemy to the Christian religion, and, therefore, a bad man. This foul calumny the principal Remonstrants so far resented as to request M. Le Clerc, professor in their college at Amsterdam, and one of the most learned men of his age, publicly to refute it, and accuse Jurieu as a slanderer. In complying with the request of the superiors of this communion, M. Le Clerc says he does not do it to undeceive the public, but to bring Jurieu, if possible, to ask pardon of God for the sin he has committed in calumniating his neighbour in so odious a manner. And then addressing him, says, "Your blind zeal has distracted you; may the Lord, therefore, forgive you, for you know not what you do." To this rebuke, says Bayle, Jurieu was silent. This writer, though no lover of Episcopius, or his opinions, nevertheless declares he could not let the defamatory conduct of Jurieu, toward Simon Episcopius, pass unnoticed; and thought it right also to state, to the honour of M. Jurieu, that when thus charged with defamation, he repaired, by his silence, the injury he had done to the memory of this learned man. He might, he says, have invented a hundred quirks, tricks, and equivocations, to maintain his accusation, and have been sure that abundance of people would have believed what he chose to say against the Arminian minister. And then adds, I own it would still have been more creditable to him to have confessed his error, but men rarely arrive at such a pitch of heroic virtue.

CHAPTER XIX.

Having thus closed the memoirs of Episcopius, we shall take the liberty of offering a few remarks on that conflict of opinion which existed between the abettors of the sentiments of Calvin and those of Arminius, as it had been carried on some time before the Synod of Dort, for the purpose of noticing the causes of the latter failing to effect the designs of the Dutch Calvinist divines, who had been so clamorously anxious to obtain its appointment. Zealous advocates for the doctrines of the Geneva school, the Contra-Remonstrants had hoped, by the presence of so many eminent theologians from most of the reformed Churches of Europe, and by the sanction of those princes who had deputed them, to accomplish two objects which lay near their hearts. The one was to frame, upon Calvinistic principles, something like a faultless creed; the other was that of securing its universal adoption by the reformed Church, and in the dream of hope they had anticipated its being unhesitatingly uttered by the lips of the hundreds of thousands of its members. To effect their designs, two measures were to be carried, namely, to deprive the Remonstrant clergy of their office as ministers, and the use of the press in Holland; and, secondly, to induce the princes of different states to enforce, by their authority, the decisions of the synod upon their Churches. The former they easily effected, but in the latter they totally failed. This of course was to be expected: for the princes who had deputed theological professors, or other divines, to take part in the proceedings of this assembly, had so done from political motives to serve Prince Maurice; and when the temporary occasion which led to the adoption of such a measure ceased, their veneration for the authority of the decrees of the synod terminated. And hence Neal, when speaking of our James, who was a principal agent in promoting the calling of this synod, and sanctioned its proceedings while it was sitting, says that he not only afterward disregarded its decisions, but prohibited the very dogmas it had established from being preached in the English Churches. Besides, as the members of this assembly, unlike the popish clergy, belonged to separate and independent Churches, each having its own jurisdiction without any commonly-admitted head, to whose dictum they were bound to submit, so we find that the decisions of this body of divines had nothing of that commanding, authoritative character that marked those of the Council of Trent, which had sat some years before. Hence it is, that while the latter gave a more systematic form to Popery than it had previously possessed, so its decrees were made binding throughout the whole of that community, and they were therefore attended with permanent results.*

But though the members of the Synod of Dort might be the advocates of ecclesiastical authority, and put forth their claims to it as largely as did Gomarus, who, as before stated, supported the old papal doctrine of the Church being independent of the state, not indeed by a papal supremacy, but by a collateral power, nevertheless the reformed Churches had nothing existing with them as a substitute for that authority which was concentrated in the pope, by which he enforced the decrees of councils, and demanded assent to what were called the doctrines of the Church. On this account we find, immediately after the breaking up of the conclave of Protestant divines at Dort, that the inefficacy of its decisions to secure respect for them from those for whom they had really been framed, soon appeared, inasmuch as even in some parts of the Netherland Churches they were not received, as in Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Gelderland, and Groningen, while those of Bremen and Brandeburg, which made a considerable figure among the reformed Churches of Germany, would not suffer their doctors to be tied down by the tenets of the Dutch divines as maintained in the synod.

---

* See Millar's Philosophy of History.

Besides, the Remonstrants, though prohibited from publishing their sentiments in Holland either by their ministers or through the Dutch press, nevertheless, as has already been shown, were enabled to get their writings printed in other countries, and they were rapidly circulated through various parts of the continent of Europe. Some of these persons were men of extraordinary powers, such as Episcopius, Grotius, Uitenbogaerdt, Grevinchovius, Corvinus, with Vossius and Barlæus, who were incessant in their attacks upon the sentiments of the opposite party, many of whom, in the hour of debate, had presented to public notice the doctrines of Calvin and Beza, with certain appendages of their own, in a revolting manner. This was especially the case with Maccovius,* who, on account of his rash assertions, was charged by some of the members of the synod with heresy, but who escaped its condemnation through the arts of Festus Hommius; nevertheless, his sentiments had found their way into the world, and it was seen from what he and others, equally bold, had said of God being the author of sin and reprobating men, that they had shown themselves to be persons of stern natures, who were as cold as marble, and as hard as iron, and who, exempt from all the kindly feelings of humanity, could look on the greater part of mankind with unfeeling disregard and heartless indifference, "even as a man may look upon the most ignoble of the brutal orders." It was not likely that such individuals should be able to rule the thinkings of others, so far as to bring them into a state of acquiescence with their revolting views of the Divine Being; and we consider that the complaints uttered against him, and the warning notices sent out about the time of the Synod of Dort to other theologians, to be more guarded in their statements, with the milder form of Calvinism itself which obtained in the Synod of Dort, in direct opposition to Gomarus and most of the Dutch Calvinistic clergy, was significant of the ascending, though unacknowledged, influence of the milder views of Arminius upon the members of this assembly. And had his followers from that period been scattered, and never allowed to assume the form of a public and separate community, to prevent which the Dutch Calvinists adopted against them all the various modes of persecution we have stated; yet they would command the veneration and gratitude of every lover of our common Christianity, for the successful efforts they made to keep back the gathering cloud which was covering the face of the Reformed Churches, and under which bold metaphysical speculations on the mysterious subjects of foreknowledge, predestination, &c., were made the topics of the public ministry in the Churches, instead of the saving doctrines of the Gospel; while the reception of the former was too frequently identified with safety, and religion itself was comtemplated as being something that was independent of a renewed heart, an obedient will to the authority of Christ, and a sanctified nature produced by the agency of the Holy Spirit. We cannot go into the history of the probable effects of such public teaching upon the mass of the people, but it appears to us that they must have been pernicious, inasmuch as the injunctions of the Gospel, designed to issue in habits of practical piety, were held in abeyance to doctrinal statements, and a prominence was so far given to the knowledge and reception of creed as to make them the ultimate object of all instruction, instead of the recovery of the soul from the effects of the fall by the renovating power of Divine grace.

---

* Coccius says he fought valiantly for the faith, and that it fared with him as with a good dog, who gets himself into trouble in guarding his master's house, for barking at the best friends of the family, as well as at strangers. See a full account of him in Nichol's "Arminianism, &c."

In forming our estimate of the moral effects of any system of theology, we are not to judge of it by its acknowledgment of a single, or even some few doctrines, which are generally received by the Christian Church, but from the character of its influence in the production of a class of motives and feelings as springs of action; and contemplating the sentiments of a large portion of the Dutch divines prior to the Synod of Dort, we say that whatever was sound in their opinions, there was much associated with them calculated to generate an awful disregard to piety, and to relax those obligations which it is absolutely necessary to recognize, in order to the formation of religious character, and to allow the sanctifying power of Christianity to have its due effect in the formation and maintenance of the same.

In arriving at something like distinct views of the sentiments that were received by the Dutch Calvinist divines, we think it is not departing from historic fidelity if we distinguish their opinions into the *esoteric* and *exoteric*. The latter might be said to be exhibited in those doctrines which were adopted by the Synod of Dort, while the *esoteric* generally prevailed in the provincial synods and classes, and formed a sort of unwritten standard, by which they tested the doctrines of those whom they wished cordially to recognize as being sound and orthodox divines. In proof of this, we have only to turn to the case of Goulart, who, on account of his preaching against the reprobation of the infants of believing Christians, and subsequently refusing to recant his sentiments, was deposed from his ministry; while the pastor d'Or suffered the same fate for denying that God was the author of sin.* Let the reader compare the implied opinions of the parties who pursued these measures against these clergymen, with Calvinism as it was softened down in the Synod of Dort by the efforts of several of the foreign, and especially the English divines, and he will admit with us that the published opinions of that assembly by no means reflected those which were embraced and taught by the Dutch Calvinist ministers in their private circles or public congregations. Hence, the total depravity of man was admitted only to maintain that it was not remediable, or at least to any great extent, even by the resources of the Gospel; the doctrine of his inability was allied to others that exhibited him as a passive machine under the means instituted to secure his salvation; and the atonement of Christ was regarded as a method of escaping the punishment due to sin, unconnected with any thing like moral restoration, while the spotless holiness of the Redeemer was accounted to the believer for righteousness, his sufferings and death as answering to the law of God for moral transgressions, and his personal obedience the substitute for the absence of it in the conduct of the believer. These dogmas were designated *The Gospel*, by way of eminence, and zeal for them identified with holy jealousy for the sole and undivided honour of Christ, in effecting the great work of redemption. Now we put it to the reader who admits human nature to be corrupt, as it is represented in Scripture, and fearfully shown to be so by the evidence of fact, whether the above sentiments, viewed in connection with that in which it was maintained, "that a man could not do more good, or less evil than he did," were not calculated to relax all earnest and zealous efforts to advance in the ways of piety, and divest him who adopted them of a sensitive apprehension of evil as it assailed him, or destroy all tendencies to compunction after he had fallen the victim of its seductive power. And when it is known that these very divines, in order to prevent the people from being shocked at the doctrine of reprobation, publicly declared that every man ought to consider himself as being of the elect,* can it be matter of surprise that the Remonstrants, in combating these doctrines, asserted that they did it from witnessing the depravity of manners among the people, as a consequence, they said, of such teaching? And, indeed, we think it must be admitted that, under such circumstances, according to the sentiment of a modern author, the parties so instructed might be tempted to believe that the Divine favour was bestowed, not merely in disregard of virtue, but in contempt of it; and then religion with all its power would be seen to contribute to swell the torrent of impurity, cupidity, and vice; and that, under the patronage of a belief like this, virtue and vice would change sides in the court of conscience, and the latter claim sacred honours.

---

* See pages 170 and 399 of this work.

---

* See Brandt.

We may here say, to the credit of some of the Calvinistic divines, that, even before the Synod of Dort, several of them rose to counteract the pernicious tendency of the inferences boldly deduced from the system of the Geneva reformer, by some persons who carried out his theological sentiments much farther, we believe, than was designed by Calvin himself. This was especially the case with relation to the doctrines just named, that is to say, human depravity, and the redemption effected by Jesus Christ, and other subjects connected with them, in which it appeared from such deductions that truth and error are often so closely allied that the one is but the excess of the other.

Among the persons who may be named as adopting measures to oppose the perversion of this system in some of its parts, was Piscator, who became the opponent of the doctrine of the imputation of the active righteousness of Christ, from the fact of his being aware that those who espoused it were in danger of considering themselves to be under no obligation to attend to injunctions or moral precepts, while they pretended to see themselves released from them by their interest in the Gospel, and by Christ's obedience being imputed to them, which supplied the want of it in themselves. But whatever resistance was manifested to the excesses of Calvinism among the Churches of the Reformed before the Synod of Dort, it was after the breaking up of that assembly that they were more especially opposed. Besides those Churches already named in Holland and Germany, which refused to receive the canons of the Synod of Dort, we must now proceed to notice the opposition that set in against them in the Gallic Protestant Churches. The reader will recollect that we named the case of some of the French divines demurring, when required to receive them according to the appointment of the Synod of Alez; and subsequently of Curcellæus at the Synod of Charenton. But the man who gave full strength to the rising opposition which was about to break forth against the more rigid forms of Calvin's and Beza's doctrines was the celebrated Scotchman, Cameron, whom we have frequently mentioned in these pages as being the opponent of Episcopius on the subject of the freedom of the will. The two dogmas which he principally opposed were, the imputation of the active righteousness of Christ, and the non-concurrence of the human will with the influence of the grace of God in man's conversion. For he, too, like Piscator and others, saw that where men were taught to believe in *imputed*, there would be no attempt made to gain *actual* holiness; and when obedience was performed by Christ for and instead of them, then to attempt it on their part would be viewed as an act of supererogation, while the cognate opinion that denied the concurrence of the human will with the influence of Divine grace to effect conversion, neutralized all efforts to obtain the enjoyment of experimental religion, inasmuch as such efforts were branded as being legal and pharisaical. While opposing these sentiments, he adopted from the creed of Arminius the doctrine of universal redemption, and that of the necessity of presenting without restriction the offers of grace to all men. But though he espoused these opinions, so accordant with those of the Remonstrants, yet, seeing them deprived of religious freedom and subject to confiscation of property, exile, or imprisonment, it was not to be supposed, that unless he had gone all the lengths of their system, he would be disposed to avow himself the patron of their doctrines. To be designated an Arminian, even now, is offensive to some who nearly approach to the Dutch divine in doctrinal sentiments, but it was much more so at that period. Even to this day, we understand that in Holland this name is a badge of reproach to the followers of this great man, more than is the term of Methodist in this country. We are not intending to say that Cameron was prepared to adopt the benevolent system of Arminius in all its parts, but the stand he made against the contracted and exclusive doctrines of Calvinism, by his avowal of the above sentiments, gave a mighty check to them, as they had prevailed at the close of the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth centuries.

After the death of Cameron, his disciple Amyraut, or Amyraldus, who had studied under him, supported his system. This man, says Mosheim, was a person of uncommon sagacity and erudition, and though he was strongly opposed in his attempts to spread the opinions of his master, nevertheless he applied himself, from the year 1624, with unparalleled zeal to the arduous work, and displayed in it extraordinary exertions of capacity and genius; and so ardently was he bent on bringing it into execution, that he made for this purpose no small changes in the doctrine commonly received among the reformed in France. His leading position was, "that God desires the happiness of all men, and that no mortal is excluded by a *Divine decree* from the benefits that are procured by the death, sufferings, and Gospel of Christ." A cry was raised in several French synods against the doctrine of Amyraut, but after it had been carefully examined by them, and defended by him at their public meetings with his usual eloquence and erudition, he was honourably acquitted; and his sentiments won their way, and were adopted by some of the most eminent among the reformed ministers, such as Daillie, Blondel, Mestrezat, and Claude, so that they were not only received in all the universities of the Huguenots in France, and embraced by divines of the highest note in that nation, but likewise spread themselves as far as Geneva, and after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, were disseminated by the French refugees throughout all the reformed Churches of Europe, so that even in Holland they insinuated themselves among the people, to the great mortification of some of the rigid Dutch Calvinists, who openly complained that these refugees had imported into the country a species of refined Arminianism.

Such was the progress of this milder form of Calvinism, during the life of Amyraut, which, after his decease, approached still nearer to the expansive system of Arminius, and spread more widely among the reformed Churches of Europe. This approximation to the opinions of the Dutch professor, it is true, was unacknowledged by those who retained the name of Calvinists; yet, while the latter adopted this milder system, and became Universalists, that is, maintained that Jesus Christ *by the grace of God, tasted death for every man*, and offered salvation to all on the principle that God will *have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth;* it will be seen, that whatever saving clauses the parties who embraced this theory might have in favour of Calvinism in its more rigid forms, nevertheless, while they acted upon that of Amyraut, as just stated, they undermined the decisions and dogmas of the Synod of Dort; and thus, in less than fifty years after the sittings of that assembly, it may be said, that the end proposed by the rigid Dutch Calvinists in that conclave was completely discomfited; and to the great grief of some of their successors, instead of the narrow and bigoted supralapsarian system of Gomarus being universally received among the reformed, according to the intention of the Dutch divines in calling the synod, there now came forth a more benevolent and godlike system, that looked with benign aspect upon the whole of mankind.

Having given this sketch of the progress of religious opinion among the reformed of the continent, especially in relation to the sentiments of Arminius, we may now turn to our own country. Among the persons who contributed to neutralize the effect of the decisions of the Synod of Dort in this kingdom, was the celebrated Richard Baxter, who, while the avowed advocate of its doctrines, adopted, at the same time, the opinions of Amyraut; and in speaking of his own system, calls it the middle way of Cameron and Amyraldus. Like the two persons just named, he maintained that Christ made a satisfaction by his death equally for the sins of every man; and that the blessings of salvation were to be freely and indiscriminately offered to all. In his anxiety to unite the Calvinists and Arminians, it was said that he conceded so much to both, that he sometimes showed himself to be more Calvinistic than Calvin, and at other times more Arminian than Arminius. With what may be deemed the contradictory parts of his theory we have nothing to do, but we rejoice in the circumstance of its presenting to those who became its advocates ground on which to stand, from whence they could offer salvation to man in general. And thus, under the influence of this more expansive system, an extended scope was allowed to the benevolent feelings of the Christian minister, to come up to the spirit of the philanthropy of our Divine and beneficent religion, and meet the injunction of its gracious Founder, who commanded his disciples to *Go into all the world, and preach* *the Gospel to every creature.* How far Baxter's liberal system acted upon his own conduct and feelings in moving his heart to weep over perishing sinners, and how greatly superior it is to the rigid one adopted by President Edwards, has been shown in the eloquent passage quoted from the Rev. William Hull, at page 202, to which the reader's attention is especially directed.

The measures of Baxter, however, in thus marking out a middle way, for the purpose of inducing the Calvinists and Arminians unitedly to walk in it, were soon found to be inefficient for the accomplishment of his design. To say nothing of the impracticability of such a union being effected at any time, yet, at the period alluded to, we conceive that the failure of his attempts partly arose out of the fact of the two opposite systems in this country being shortly after carried by their advocates far beyond the sentiments of their founders. In the one case, Arminianism deteriorated into a cold, heartless, legal system; while Calvinism luxuriously ripened into a bold and daring species of Antinomianism. And though at the time of which we are writing there were several who, bearing the name of Calvinists, were distinguished with much of the strength of that piety which marked the Puritan age; while many of the Arminian school retained, in full force, all the evangelical features of the sentiments of the Dutch professor; nevertheless it was too generally the case that the abettors of the latter sunk into Pelagianism, while the former either went into Antinomianism or passed over to Arianism, and from thence entered the downward road to Socinianism. But a memorable epoch was at hand, for Wesley and Whitefield were about to come forth, to give a check to the cold legality of the one, and the reckless disregard of obligation in the other. And while these two distinguished men were directed to labour in opposite tracks, and some diversity of sentiment existed between them on what might be called the five points, yet the might of their energies and their stirring appeals were directed to the same object, the salvation of immortal souls. And in spreading abroad the savour of the knowledge of Christ in every place, they showed how evangelical Arminianism and practical Calvinism could contribute to the same result, that of awakening men to the great concerns of religion, in order to prepare the way for the elevation of the character of their hearers to a state of moral excellence and purity.

The nature of the addresses of these two extraordinary men, so general and apostolic, and attended with such wonderful effects, might be supposed to command many imitators of their liberal views, which for a time was the case. But the circumstance of Whitefield's adopting Calvinistic opinions tended greatly to revive and diffuse the system of the Geneva reformer through the land. This can be no matter of surprise; for while the religious excitement of that period gave activity to theological inquiries, it was natural to minds inclined to speculation, and especially those which had some taste for metaphysical discussion, to be entangled in the questions of predestination, prescience, necessity, and human freedom; and while the dogmas of Calvin were held by several ministers in conjunction with vital and saving truths, and their labours were honoured with great usefulness, nevertheless, with others, an incautiousness in their statements of the doctrines of grace and fate prepared the way for the most mischievous consequences; and Antinomianism, grafted on the Calvinistic system, as espoused by many of them, tended to produce a withering effect upon the more evangelical theory that was embraced by the devout and pious of that creed.

This tendency of Calvinism to verge toward the licentiousness of Antinomianism may here be named, also, as one of those causes which operated to hold in check and abate the influence of this system in its more rigid forms, as received and held by some persons. Hence the alarm that was excited at different times in the minds of the more pious ministers of the Geneva creed, as to the pernicious character of Antinomianism, which awfully operates to subvert religion, by freeing the conscience from the requirements of piety, while asserting that he who is interested in the Gospel is released from all obligation to the law, or submission to the injunctions and preceptive parts of Christianity, prompted them, without referring to Arminianism, to adopt its *cautions* and *conditions*, in order to prevent their own system from issuing in such results among their hearers.

To prove the correctness of this statement, we shall come near to our own day, for the purpose of marking an extreme state of Calvinistic religious opinion, as contributing to give to the *conditions* found in the creed of the Dutch professor an important claim to the notice of the moderate school of Calvinism. We allude, says an eloquent writer,* when treating on this subject, "to the late bold and frontless exhibition of the Antinomian heresy, as advocated by certain preachers of more than ordinary name, who have recently effected a schism in the Church of England. These persons, after being first inducted into the principles of the Calvinistic system, were afterward enticed upward to its highest and most dangerous pinnacles. From thence they fearlessly launched into a profound too vast for them to explore, and where they still find no resting place. Like Satan toiling in chaos, they

> 'As in a cloudy chair ascending, ride
> Audacious; but that seat soon failing, meet
> A vast vacuity.'

And if they at any time succeed in reaching a world of light, it is only, like him, to infest some paradise, and to poison the mind of some unwary soul by their *filthy dreams.*"

Many divines of the more moderate Calvinistic school, both in the Church and among the Dissenters, felt themselves called upon to guard their flocks against what was significantly called "not a religious error, but an attempt to substitute a system of subtle and specious impiety in the room of Christianity;"† and individuals, who before had given striking prominence to the peculiarities of the Calvinistic creed, designating them the *doctrines of grace*, were led to see that by surrounding these with a certain degree of importance, as though they constituted the essence of the Gospel, they had prepared the way for fearful results, and were determined not to give them the same conspicuous place in their ministrations as heretofore. In proof of this we cannot forbear giving the following incident from Mr. Jackson's Life of the late Rev. Richard Watson. And although, from the extended circulation of that work, it must be well known, nevertheless, its appropriateness to our subject will warrant its insertion here. We allude to the case of the late venerable Rowland Hill, who, in addressing Mr. Watson, among a company of ministers of the independent denomination, and supposing him to be one of them, said, "'Whatever shall we do, sir, to prevent the spread of Antinomianism, which is making such dreadful havoc of many of our country Churches? Don't you think, sir, there is really something in our Calvinistic doctrines which is calculated to produce this terrible evil?' Mr. Watson, who was taken by surprise, and felt himself placed in a somewhat peculiar situation, assented to Mr. Hill's suggestions; and the aged apostle of Calvinian theology added, in his own emphatic manner, 'I spent my younger days in fighting the Arminian devil; but I will spend the rest of my life in fighting the devil of Antinomianism.' This pledge that excellent man fully redeemed, and though it is not pretended that he renounced the peculiarities of his creed, yet they were less prominent in his ministrations than they had formerly been."

---

* The late Richard Watson. † The late Robert Hall.

Among the persons who saw the propriety of adopting measures similar to those of this patriarch, was the late Robert Hall, who, in his preface to Chase's "Antinomianism Unmasked," admitted that the paucity of practical instruction, and the custom of almost exclusively dwelling on doctrinal topics, paved the way for Antinomianism; and that ministers, while dwelling wholly upon doctrinal subjects, were astonished at perceiving the eager impetuosity with which a part of their hearers rushed into Antinomian excesses, when a thorough investigation might have convinced them that though they had inculcated the truth, it had not been altogether *as it is in Jesus;* and then proceeds to say "that the prevailing practice of representing the promises of the Gospel as *unconditional*, tends to such a result. The idea of *meritorious conditions* is, indeed, incompatible with the Gospel, considered as a system of grace; but if there be no conditions of salvation, how is it possible to confute the pretensions and confound the confidence of the most licentious professor. [Besides,] all promises must either be made to individuals by name or, indefinitely, to persons of a specific character. A moment's attention will be sufficient to satisfy us that the promise of pardon is of the latter description. In no one instance is it addressed to the individual by name, but to the penitent, the believing, the obedient, or to some similar specification of character. Before any person, therefore, can justly appropriate the promise to himself, he must ascertain his possession of that character, or, which is precisely the same, he must perceive that he comes within the prescribed conditions. This absurd notion of *unconditional* promises, by severing the assurance of salvation from all the fruits of the Spirit, from every trace and feature of a renovated nature and a regenerate state, opens the widest possible door to licentiousness."

On this passage Mr. Watson says, "If this be Calvinism, it leaves but little to be disputed among those who feel the force of the principle laid down by the apostle,—*For circumcision is nothing, neither uncircumcision, but a new creature.** Its peculiarities are reduced to the rank and consequence of mere abstract speculations, thrown constantly into the distance, and never suffered to intrude into any question of religious experience or religious duty."* And we shall leave it with the reader who is the least acquainted with the Calvinism with which the Remonstrants had to contend, and the mitigated form of it as generally adopted at the present day, to judge whether the latter has not approached to the views of the Remonstrants, who were branded as heretics, and some of them expelled their country; while others were exposed to imprisonment and death for maintaining views similar to the above, by men whose successors in name, though not in creed, now as much as ourselves rejoice that a system so expansive, though not acknowledged to be Arminian, has very extensively won its way, especially among the British Churches. As to ourselves, we certainly believe that a movement has been made from Calvinism to Arminianism, a fact we state not with vain triumph, but thankfulness, as being for the world's benefit; and, therefore, concur with the sentiment of a modern writer of the moderate school of Calvinism, when he says "that as there is no difference in guilt, so there is none either in the conditions of pardon or in the eligibility of men to the Divine favour, and that God puts no difference between man and man;—is no respecter of persons; and that *in* EVERY NATION *he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him.*—Bright expansion of

---

* Although, according to Mr. Jackson, "Mr. Watson had many serious objections to the tenets of Calvinism, when considered in detail, and he was conscientiously opposed to the system as a whole; and he was accustomed to observe that its essential principles are not deduced from the word of God, interpreted according to its general popular import, but from metaphysical speculation concerning the Divine nature; nevertheless, no man cherished more of the spirit of liberality toward those who maintained the system of Calvin than he. This will be seen from the following statement:—We are not at all wishful to see our own peculiar views adopted by pious Calvinists, nor do we feel any disposition to force upon the attention of such persons their peculiar notions against their own wills, nor persist to charge their creed with consequences which they disavow, merely because such consequences appear to us to be the logical conclusions of their premises, and may, by the rules of strict reasoning, be very legitimate. And although in proportion as we believe those sentiments which distinguish the Calvinistic creed from evangelical Arminianism to be contrary to the Scriptures, and injurious to the practice of the Christian temper and conduct, we rejoice that they are sinking in the estimation of wise and pious men. Nevertheless, we had rather see errors of this kind gradually fade away, than suddenly pushed out of sight. One of the greatest dangers of the human mind arises from sudden revulsions of opinion. Truth and error are so linked together, one being often the mere shadow or the excess of the other, that he who abandons error itself too hastily may renounce some important and essential truth, around which it has spread parasitical branches, or diffused a deceptive halo. From Calvinism, through a cold and legal Arminianism, there has been too often a sudden transition to Socinianism; and he greatly injures Calvinism in its strongest

---

forms if he would not prefer its existence, with all its dangers and occasional excesses, to a system which has in it no human hope, because it recognizes no one principle of human recovery from the guilt and penalty of sin, as stated in the Holy Scriptures.

* If the above writer could say this, in relation to the passage thus given in the text, with how much more justice might it be said of the following statement of Mr. Hall: "I believe firmly in general redemption; I often preach it; and I consider the fact that Christ died for all as the only basis that can support the universal offer of the Gospel. I consider the sacrifice of Christ as a remedy, not only adapted, but intended for all, and as placing all in a salvable state, and removing all barriers to their salvation, except such as arise from their own perversity and depravity."*

Some modern Calvinists assert that their offers of salvation to men are as general as those of the Arminians.—Be it so; we are glad to hear it.

* Life of the late Robert Hall, by Dr, Gregory, p. 118.

heavenly glory! Welcome news from on high! with emphasis may we say, in hearing this canon of grace—*The true light now shineth!*"

Another circumstance growing out of the mitigated character of Calvanism, as introduced by Amyrant, must not be omitted on this occasion, that is, the cultivation of a more tolerant spirit among the divines of the Calvinistic school. The Remonstrants, who had imbibed the opinions, and copied the conduct of the amiable Arminius, were the first among the Protestants of Europe* to lift up their voice on this subject, and assert it to be possible for a friendly union to exist among individuals, though differing in minor shades of doctrine; and thus anticipated the Church by two hundred years in anxiously wishing to see the extinction of intolerance and bigotry among Christians, and the cultivation of the spirit of amity, as it is witnessed, at least to a great extent, at the present day, in this country.†

---

* Barneveldt, who was the principal lay leader of the Remonstrants, "was perhaps the first statesman," says Evans Crowe, "that made religious toleration one of his maxims."—*Lardner's Cyclopædia*, vol. xlvi, p. 210.

† Among the persons who seem incapable of coming up to the spirit of the times, and ridding themselves of the bigotry of former days, is Dr. Bennett. This man, it is known, several years since, published, in conjunction with the late Dr. Bogue, *A History of the Dissenters*, in which Arminianism, and the names of Wesley and Fletcher, were assailed with a degree of virulence worthy of Toplady, of bitter notoriety. Of the amiable Fletcher it is said in this work that in his writings he showed that he was "often very devoutly wicked, and almost blasphemed from a sense of duty." After the lapse of near thirty years Bennett sent forth a second edition of this work, with very little abatement of the temper and bigotry manifested in the first, a fact from which we gather that he intends the sun to go down upon his wrath. We think we have discovered the cause of the asperity of this man against Arminianism, or Wesleyan Methodism. In his early days he was apprenticed, at Bath, to a person of the name of Bowin, a cabinet-maker and upholsterer, "who was a good man and a Methodist class leader. I am not sure," says our informant, "that he [Bennett] met in class at the time he was with Mr. Bowin, but, to the best of my recollection, that was the case." If it could be made out satisfactorily that this man, while an apprentice to the above person, was a member of the Methodist society, the difficulty of accounting for his *unabating malignity* toward that communion would cease, because it would then be seen to be the malignity of a RENEGADE.

It is said that the two doctors were in the habit of declining the

Some English writers, to their honour be it stated, have done these liberal men the justice to admit this fact, though others have claimed it for persons of our own country, of the Independent denomination of Cromwell's day. But the parties who have so done have shown that they were not acquainted with the history of the Dutch Arminians; otherwise they would not have put forth such pretensions. In the march of liberal feeling, as before stated, Episcopius, next to Arminius, stands the great-leader, a circumstance which, among many others, was put to his account to prove that he was a heretic and a sinner. Hence it was said, "Il professé publiqement la tolérance de toutes les sectes qui reconnoissoient l'autorité de l'Ecriture-Sainté, de quelque maniere qu'elles l'expliquent. C'etoit ouvrir la porte à toutes les erreurs. Cette opinion l'avoit fait soupçonner de Socinianisme."* Such were the notions that prevailed some time after his death, that is; for a person to be tolerant was to be a bad man, and to be liberal was to be a heretic.

That the system of Amyrant would prepare the way for the cultivation of the spirit of tolerance and forbearance among the Calvinists of the continent, Curcellæus had distinctly predicted. His anticipations of such a result were founded upon the fact of many of the pastors among the reformed having embraced the views of this divine, while others as violently opposed them; and he saw that unless they cultivated a spirit of forbearance toward each other, their Churches must inevitably be rent in pieces. He, therefore, concluded that the French Calvinists would be impelled by the apprehension of common danger to cherish a better state of feeling among themselves, and that, as a consequenee, the Arminians would reap the advantage of it, as it would necessarily manifest itself to others. The event, which he thus foresaw, actually took place. And though, for a time, the

---

merit of the authorship of some parts of this work. It is impossible for us to say which portion of it was written by Dr. Bennett; but certainly, if we may judge of his talents for writing, by his *Lectures on the History of Jesus Christ*, the baldness and meagerness of which are confessed even by his own party, we should not be disposed to attribute to him what may be deemed the more intellectual part of the above history.

* Nouveau Dictionaire Historique; article, Episcopius.

reformed maintained a hostile front to the followers of Arminius; and Amyraut himself, when Curcellæus, in one of his publications, praised him for some of his expansive views, flung back the compliment with disdain, being unwilling to accept it from such a quarter, lest it should bring him into bad odour with his Calvinistic friends, who, at that time, were eager to obtain proofs by which they might, with apparent truth, fix upon him the designation of Arminian, an epithet that was the scarecrow of the Calvinists of that age; nevertheless, the working of this system was precisely such as Curcellæus had foretold, and its patrons, in spite of themselves, schooled by circumstances, were taught to imbibe a spirit of tolerance, cherish milder views, and pursue a more liberal course of conduct toward their fellow Christians. This will appear from the fact, that the more moderate of the reformed ministers, whose brethren had previously scrupled to allow Grotius to have communion with them directly after he went to that country, now, under the influence of the more generous principles of Amyraut, and with him at their head, waited upon this distinguished Dutch scholar, and entreated him to unite with them in Church fellowship, saying that they admitted the Confession of the Remonstrants to be orthodox and sound. And when he intimated his attachment to the doctrines of Chrysostom and Melancthon, it was answered that this would be no ground of objection to his admission among them.

The spirit of tolerance and kindly feeling which came in the train of Amyraut's system, and manifested itself on the occasion just alluded to, became more apparent year after year, insomuch that those who fifty years before had furiously debated upon the five points, soon began to tolerate the different opinions of each other upon these articles. Hence, Mosheim, in allusion to the state of feeling existing in relation to these points in the eighteenth century, says, "The Reformed Church, as a community, comprehends in its bosom Arminians, Calvinists, and Universalists, who live together in charity and friendship, and unite their efforts in healing the breach, and diminishing the weight and importance of those controversies which separate them from each other."

The Dutch Calvinistic Churches seem to have been the last to concur with this amended state of feeling, and while several of its members lamented, in the most sorrowful strains, what they deemed the laxity of the Church's discipline, in not excluding from its bosom those who cultivated more liberal opinions; nevertheless, as the latter, even at that time, were superior in point of number, power, and influence, the mournful and bigoted wailings of the former were heard with indifference. "Whoever, therefore, considers all these things with due attention, will be obliged to acknowledge that neither the Lutherans nor the Arminians have at this day any farther subject of controversy or debate with the Reformed Church, considered in a general point of view, but only with individuals who are members of this great community. For the Church, regarded in its collective and general character, allows now to all its members the full liberty of entertaining the sentiments they think most reasonable in relation to those points of doctrine that formerly excluded the Lutherans and Arminians from its communion; and looks upon the essence of Christianity and its fundamental truths as in no wise affected by them, however variously they may be explained by the contending parties."*

---

* The liberality of the present day, it appears, however, is not sufficient to obtain an admission from some of the disciples of the Geneva reformer that those who embrace Arminianism are to be deemed orthodox. Hence, when application was made to the university of Aberdeen, by Dr. H———, for the degree of D.D. for the late Rev. Joseph Benson, it was refused, on the alleged ground that a compliance with it "might be construed into an approval of his theological sentiments." This man, who has been pronounced "eminent for learning, and remarkable for eloquence,"* and confessed, by the liberal of all sects, to have been one of the ablest divines of modern days, and whose ministry was the means of spreading vital religion through an extended circle, was, nevertheless, considered, by these Scotch academicians, unfit to be recognized as a sound divine. It was proposed, however, to Dr. H——— to bestow a literary degree on this venerable minister, instead of a theological one, on account of course of his not being sound in the faith. The offer, under such circumstances, was properly rejected. Mr. Benson never knew of this application of his friends to secure for him this intended honour.

When these gentlemen, according to a document before us, judged that giving a degree of D.D. to Mr. Benson might be "construed into an approval of his theological sentiments," perhaps they thought,

* British Critic, July, 1834.

In our own country, that famous Arminian, John Goodwin, was the first to lift up his voice in favour of toleration; and while the Presbyterians breathed out anathemas against him and those who imitated his conduct, and branded them with the most opprobrious names, Goodwin undauntedly advocated its necessity,* and thus Arminianism boldly led the way for its introduction among ourselves. Passing from this period to that of the Hills and Toplady, in which the spirit of bigotry broke forth in the most violent manner against the Wesleys and the amiable John Fletcher, we can but rejoice in knowing that the meek spirit of the latter, by transfusing so much of catholic feeling into his writings, showed how possible it was to oppose an atagonist with all that was kindly, Christian, and holy; and thereby proved that brethren might dwell together in unity of feeling, though differing on minor points of doctrine. To all the illiberal things said to this saintly man on account of his Checks to Antinomianism, and the bigotry of the High Calvinists of his day, his reply was, "I wanted more love when I wrote, and I want

---

with old Hussey,* that to be an Arminian was to be a sinner of no ordinary character, inasmuch, he says, as he breaks the ten commandments. This he proves in the following manner: "Arminians make a *divinity* of *men's power*, and so are guilty of *idolatry*. The second command is broke by *bowing down* to this idol. The third is broke by speaking of *ineffectual grace*, for to do this is to *take God's name in vain.*————Arminians break the seventh by *committing adultery* with their idol, the work of their own hands. ————And they break the tenth by *coveting their neighbour's interest in God and Christ.*" Now, certainly, if men are not to be partakers of other people's sins, these Northern Lights showed their wisdom in taking care that they did not do any thing to approve of theological sentiments marked by such wicked practices. One would, however, like to know how many Socinians, both on this and the other side of the Tweed, have received from the Scotch universities the degree of D.D.

* "It is also highly honourable to him, though the fact is but little known, that he was the first of our countrymen who excited general attention by writing distinctly and explicitly in defence of universal liberty of conscience, as one of the most sacred rights of human nature. He had published several admirable tracts against all coercive interference in matters purely religious, before either Locke or Milton, or even Dr. Owen, wrote a single line on the subject."—*Preface to Jackson's Life of John Goodwin.*

* Hussey's Glory of Christ, p. 526.

more now;" that is, toward those who abused and slandered him. It was impossible, after the subsiding of the feeling excited in the hour of debate, that the spirit in which such a man's writings were dictated should not produce a plastic effect, in moulding others to a temper similar to his own; and that subsequent controversies on the disputed points should not be conducted with amity and kindness. This would the more readily follow from these controversies contributing to effect what the subject of these memoirs saw to be necessary, in order to the extinction of bitterness and asperity among those who differed on minor points of doctrine, that is, a distinction between essentials and nonessentials, and a recognition of those leading views on both sides by which the great ends of Christianity are secured, after which, there might be allowed, not only a disparity of opinion on minor points, but it would farther be seen that while certain subjects present different degrees of difficulty to different minds, controversies upon them may not only be made to afford improvement to the intellectual powers, but also be an occasion for the trial of mutual charity among Christians.*

---

* "The differences among fierce and fiery controvertists appeal in vain for sanction to the wisdom and will of God; but the differences which exist among pious and moderate men, honest in their inquiries after truth, are the powers which balance and regulate the religious world in this state of infirmity, as the different attractions of the solar system preserve every planet in its orbit, and regulate the due measure of its heat and cold. From the period of the controversy conducted by the founders of Methodism in this country, a moderate Calvinism has arisen; the Antinomian errors have been greatly checked; and spiritual and practical religion rendered less liable to abatement from the operation of the peculiarities of the Calvinistic system among evangelical professors."—*Watson.*

Whether the following particulars will be considered as a proof of "a moderate Calvinism having arisen," we shall leave the reader to judge for himself:—

Mr. Thomason, late missionary in India, when examined by Messrs. Foster and Cecil, on behalf of the Elland Society, after being interrogated as to his reasons for preferring the Church to Mr. Wesley's connection, was then asked by Mr. Cecil, "whether he adopted the opinions of Calvin or Arminius?" "Indeed, sir," said he, "I have never read a book on the subject, except the Bible, in my life. I have always made it a point to leave those things, as I think it productive of evil to dive into intricacies which can never be perfectly cleared." "You think very rightly," said Mr. Cecil, Hailing every sign of such an amended state of feeling, we take this opportunity of recording it to the honour of the late Robert Hall, whose character and talents were calculated to exercise a powerful influence upon others, that when writing to a friend, and adverting to the asperity displayed by Toplady, he says, "I have just been reading Dr. Whitehead's Life of Wesley. It has given me a much more enlarged idea of the virtues and labours of that extraordinary man than I ever had before. I would not incur the guilt of that virulent abuse which Toplady cast upon him, for points merely speculative, and of very little importance, for ten thousand worlds. When will the Christian world cease disputing about religion, and begin to enter into its spirit, and practise its precepts?" This day we hope is approaching, and the existence of events by which good men are called to meet together on occasions which concern the common Christianity, and dissolve the frigid contractions of suspicion in the glowing ardour of the same element of love and zeal, is rapidly bringing it near.

The spirit of unity and co-operation found to exist among missionaries of different bodies* in distant lands,

---

who must be considered Calvinistic in his opinions; "I have acted in the same manner myself. I make it a point never to handle these things in public. But you say you have read the Bible—What views do you gather from the Bible?" "Sir," said he, "my views, as gathered from the Bible, are simply these, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'"

* It is pleasing to know that a very different state of feeling exists now among missionaries to that which existed with those sent out in the ship Duff, in 1797, to the islands of the South Seas. Among the persons who accompanied them was a Methodist, by the name of Jefferies, a blacksmith by trade. This man, zealous to assist in spreading Christianity among the heathen, offered to accompany the missionaries. In doing this, he avowed his sentiments to be Arminian. His manly frankness, and evident piety, won upon the directors, while his being a blacksmith, it was rightly judged by them, would render him a valuable acquisition to the mission; and they accordingly acted up to the principles upon which this institution was professed to be founded, that of uniting with, and receiving aid from Christians of any and every section of the Church. Not so, however, the missionaries; for, after they had embarked, they drew up a creed highly Calvinistic, and insisted upon his subscribing it, threatening to have no farther intercourse with him if he did not comply. His conscience would not permit him to do it,

not only realizes, so far as regards themselves, the event ardently wished for by Mr. Hall, but the report of it tends to promote a similar state of feeling at home: and while the mitigated Calvinism of the present day, and the spirit of tolerance that prevails, throw into the shade the rigidness of the Geneva doctrines of the Synod of Dort, and the exclusive spirit that governed many, especially its Dutch members; and the ascendancy obtained by the doctrines of the Remonstrants, with the toleration and unity among Christians, is a realization of events for which they so seriously laboured, so the present state of things may be considered indicative of still better days. And though we do not expect to behold the *præclarum diem*, when men *shall see eye to eye*, yet we rejoice to believe that that period will ere long arrive, when every section of the Christian Church will have, as the grand object of all its labours, the preparing the way for the coming of that day when the *earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea;—and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd, and* CHRIST BE ALL, AND IN ALL.

and they acted up to their threat. After landing, he was disregarded, nay, deserted by them. Eleven of them, however, it is known, soon quitted the island, and went to New South Wales; the rest were discountenanced by the natives; but Jefferies, on account of his trade, was deemed so important a personage by them as to be treated with the utmost consideration. At this time he acted the part of blacksmith and preacher of the Gospel among them; and by his labours chiefly, under the blessing of God, that work was for some time carried on, which has now so amazingly extended in that part of the globe. His amiable conduct prepared the way for three of these missionaries to be allowed to join him in his efforts to establish Christianity among the natives, before the arrival of others sent out to them in the year 1800, in the Royal Admiral.

This information is from the nephew of Captain Wilson, who commanded the ship Duff, and from a missionary who has laboured in the South Sea Islands.

APPENDIX.

I. On predestination. 1. God never decreed to elect any man to eternal life, or to reprobate him from it, by his mere will and pleasure, without any regard to his foreseen obedience or disobedience, in order to demonstrate the glory of his mercy and justice, or of his power or absolute dominion.

2. As the decree of God concerning both the salvation and the destruction of every man is not the decree of an end absolutely fixed, it follows that neither are such means subordinated to that decree as through them both the elect and the reprobate may efficaciously and inevitably be brought to the destined end.

3. Wherefore, neither did God with this design in one man, Adam, create all men in an upright condition, nor did he ordain the fall or even its permission, nor did he withdraw from Adam necessary and sufficient grace, nor does he now cause the Gospel to be preached and men to be outwardly called, nor does he confer on them the gifts of the Holy Spirit,—[he has done none of these things with the design] that they should be means by which he might bring some of mankind to life everlasting, and leave others of them destitute of eternal life. Christ the Mediator is not only the executor of election, but also the foundation of the very decree of election itself. The reason why some men are efficaciously called, justified, persevere in faith, and are glorified, is not because they are absolutely elected to life eternal: nor is the reason why others are deserted and left in the fall, have not Christ bestowed upon them, or, farther, why they are inefficaciously called, are hardened and damned, because these men are absolutely reprobated from eternal life.

4. God has not decreed, without the intervening of actual sins, to leave by far the greater part of mankind in the fall, and excluded from all hope of salvation.

5. God has ordained that Christ shall be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; and, in virtue of this decree, he has determined to justify and save those who believe in him, and to administer to men the means which are necessary and sufficient for faith, in such a manner as he knows to be befitting his wisdom and justice. But he has not in any wise determined, in virtue of an absolute decree, to give Christ as a Mediator for the elect only, and to endow them alone with faith through an effectual call, to justify them, to preserve them in the faith, and to glorify them.

6. Neither is any man by some absolute antecedent decree rejected from life eternal, nor from means sufficient to attain it: so that the merits of Christ, calling, and all the gifts of the Spirit, are capable of profiting all men for their salvation, and are in reality

profitable to all men, unless by an abuse of these blessings they pervert them to their own destruction. But no man whatever is destined to unbelief, impiety, or the commission of sin, as the means and causes of his damnation.

7. The election of particular persons is absolute, from consideration of their faith in Jesus Christ and their perseverance, but not without consideration of their faith and of their perseverance in true faith as a prerequisite condition in electing them.

8. Reprobation from eternal life is made according to the consideration of preceding unbelief and perseverance in the same, but not without consideration of preceding unbelief or perseverance in it.

9. All the children of believers are sanctified in Christ; so that not one of them perishes who departs out of this life prior to the use of reason. But no children of believers who depart out of this life in their infancy, and before they have in their own persons committed any sin, are on any account to be reckoned in the number of the reprobate: so as that neither the sacred laver of baptism is, nor are the prayers of the Church, by any means capable of profiting them to salvation.

10. No children of believers who have been baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, of the Holy Ghost, and while in the state of infancy, are by an absolute decree numbered among the reprobate.

II. *On the universality of the merit of Christ.* 1. The price of redemption which Christ offered to his Father is in and of itself not only sufficient for the redemption of the whole human race, but it has also, through the decree, the will, and the grace of God the Father, been paid for all men and every man; and therefore no one is by an absolute and antecedent decree of God positively excluded from all participation in the fruits of the death of Christ.

2. Christ, by the merit of his death, has thus far reconciled God the Father to the whole of mankind,—that he can and will, without injury to his justice and truth, enter into and establish a new covenant of grace with sinners and men obnoxious to damnation.

3. Though Christ has merited for all men and for every man reconciliation with God and forgiveness of sins, yet, according to the tenor or terms of the new and gracious covenant, no man is in reality made a partaker of the benefits procured by the death of Christ in any other way than through faith; neither are the trespasses and offences of sinful men forgiven prior to their actually and truly believing in Christ.

4. Those only for whom Christ has died are obliged to believe that Christ has died for them. But those whom they call reprobates, and for whom Christ has not died, can neither be obliged so to believe, nor can they be justly condemned for the contrary unbelief; but if such persons were reprobates, they would be obliged to believe that Christ has not died for them.

III. and IV. *On the operation of grace in the conversion of man.* 1. Man has not saving faith from and of himself, nor has he it from the powers of his own free will; because in a state of sin he is able from and of himself to think, will, or do nothing that is good, nothing that is indeed savingly good; of which description, in the first place, is saving faith. But it is necessary that, by God in Christ through his Holy Spirit, he should be regenerated and renewed in his understanding, affections, will, and in all his powers, that he may be capable of rightly understanding, meditating, willing, and performing such things as are savingly good.

2. We propound the grace of God to be the beginning, the progress, and the completion of every good thing; so that even the man who is born again is not able without this preceding and prevenient, this exciting and following, this accompanying and cooperating grace, to think, to will, or to perform any good, or to resist any temptations to evil: so that good works, and the good actions which any one is able to find out by thinking, are to be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ.

3. Yet we do not believe that all the zeal, care, study, and pains, which are employed to obtain salvation, before faith and the Spirit of renovation, are vain and useless; much less do we believe that they are more hurtful to man than profitable. But, on the contrary, we consider that to hear the word of God, to mourn on account of the commission of sin, and earnestly to seek and desire saving grace and the Spirit of renovation, (none of which is any man capable of doing without Divine grace,) are not only not hurtful and useless, but that they are rather most useful and exceedingly necessary for obtaining faith and the Spirit of renovation.

4. The will of man in a lapsed or fallen state, and before the call of God, has not the capability and liberty of willing any good that is of a saving nature, and therefore we deny that the liberty of willing as well what is a saving good as what is an evil, is present to the human will in every state or condition.

5. Efficacious grace, by which any man is converted, is not irresistible: and though God so affects the will of man by his word and the inward operation of his Spirit, as to confer upon him a capability of believing, or supernatural power, and actually causes man to believe; yet man is of himself capable to spurn and reject this grace, and not believe; and, therefore, also, to perish through his own culpability.

6. Although, according to the most free and unrestrained will of God, there is very great disparity or inequality of Divine grace, yet the Holy Spirit either bestows, or is ready to bestow, upon all and upon every one to whom the word of faith is preached, as much grace as is sufficient to promote in its gradations the conversion of men; and therefore grace sufficient for faith and conversion is conceded not only to those whom God is said to be willing to save according to his decree of absolute election, but likewise to those who are in reality not converted.

7. Man is able, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, to do more good than he actually does, and to omit more evil than he actually omits. Neither do we believe that God absolutely wills that man should do no more good than that which he does, and to omit no more evil than that which he omits; nor do we believe it to have been deter-

minately decreed from all eternity that each of such acts should be so done or omitted.

8. Whomsoever God calls, he calls them seriously, that is, with a sincere and not with a dissembled intention and will of saving them. Neither do we subscribe to the opinion of those persons who assert that God outwardly calls certain men whom he does not will to call inwardly, that is, whom he is unwilling to be truly converted, even prior to their rejection of the grace of calling.

9. There is not in God a secret will of that kind which is so opposed to his will revealed in his word, that according to this same secret will he does not will the conversion and salvation of the greatest part of those whom, by the word of his Gospel, and by his revealed will, he seriously calls and invites to faith and salvation.

10. Neither on this point do we admit of a holy dissimulation, as it is the manner of some men to speak, or of a twofold person in the Deity.

11. It is not true that, through the force and efficacy of the secret will of God or of the Divine decree, not only are all good things necessarily done, but likewise all evil things; so that whosoever commit sin, they are not able, in respect of the Divine decree, to do otherwise than commit sin; and that God wills, decrees, and is the manager of men's sins, and of their insane, foolish, and cruel actions, also of the sacrilegious blasphemy of his own name; that he moves the tongues of men to blaspheme, &c.

12. We also consider it to be a false and horrible dogma, that God by *secret* means impels men to the commission of those sins which he *openly* prohibits; that those who sin do not act in opposition to the true will of God, and that which is properly so called; that what is unjust, that is, what is contrary to God's command, is agreeable to his will; nay, farther, that it is a real and capital fault to do the will of God.

V. *On the perseverance of true believers in faith.* 1. The perseverance of believers in faith is not the effect of that absolute decree of God by which he is said to have elected or chosen particular persons circumscribed with no condition of their obedience.

2. God furnishes true believers with supernatural powers or strength of grace, as much as according to his infinite wisdom he judges to suffice for their perseverance, and for their overcoming the temptations of the devil, the flesh, and the world; and on the part of God stands nothing to hinder them from persevering.

3. It is possible for true believers to fall away from true faith, and to fall into sins of such a description as cannot consist with a true and justifying faith; nor is it only possible for them thus to fall, but such lapses not unfrequently occur.

4. True believers are capable by their own fault of falling into flagrant crimes and atrocious wickedness, to persevere and die in them, and therefore finally to fall away and to perish.

5. Yet though true believers sometimes fall into grievous sins, and such as destroy the conscience, we do not believe that they immediately fall away from all hope of repentance; but we acknow

ledge this to be an event not impossible to occur,—that God, according to the multitude of his mercies, may again call them by his grace to repentance; nay, we are of opinion that such a recalling has often occurred, although such fallen believers cannot be "most fully persuaded" about this matter, that it will certainly and undoubtedly take place.

6. Therefore do we with our whole heart and soul reject the following dogmas, which are daily affirmed in various publications extensively circulated among the people, namely: (1.) "True believers cannot possibly sin with deliberate counsel and design, but only through ignorance and infirmity." (2.) "It is impossible for true believers, through any sins of theirs, to fall away from the grace of God." (3.) "A thousand sins, nay, all the sins of the whole world, are not capable of rendering election vain and void." If to this be added, "Men of every description are bound to believe that they are elected to salvation, and therefore are incapable of falling from that election," we leave men to think what a wide window such a dogma opens to carnal security. (4.) "No sins, however great and grievous they may be, are imputed to believers; nay, farther, all sins, both present and future, are remitted to them." (5.) "Though true believers fall into destructive heresies, into dreadful and most atrocious sins, such as adultery and murder, on account of which the Church, according to the institution of Christ, is compelled to testify that it cannot tolerate them in its outward communion, and that unless such persons be converted, they will have no part in the kingdom of Christ; yet it is impossible for them totally and finally to fall away from faith."

7. As a true believer is capable at the present time of being assured concerning the integrity of his faith and conscience, so he is able and ought to be at this time assured of his own salvation and of the saving good will of God toward him. On this point we highly disapprove of the opinion of the Papists.

8. A true believer, respecting the time to come, can and ought, indeed, to be assured that he is able, by means of watching, prayer, and other holy exercises, to persevere in the true faith; and that Divine grace will never fail to assist him in persevering. But we cannot see how it is possible for him to be assured that he will never afterward be deficient in his duty, but that he will persevere, in this school of Christian warfare, in the performance of acts of faith, piety, and charity, as becomes believers; neither do we consider it to be a matter of necessity that a believer should be assured of such perseverance.

ON THE HOLY TRINITY.

1. God is moreover to be considered distinctly in three persons or substances, as he has exhibited himself in the word of God, and as such to be known and contemplated by us. This Trinity of persons is known to us as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. One of these Divine persons or hypostases in the Godhead is *αναιτιος*, that is, unoriginated or unbegotten; the other begotten or generated by the

Father, or the Father's only begotten; and the other proceeding alike and emanating from the Father by the Son.

2. The Father alone is underived or unbegotten, but hath from all eternity communicated his own Divinity to his only begotten Son, made a Son, not indeed by creation, as angels were made the sons of God; not by adoption, as we, who are believers, are constituted sons of God; nor merely by a gracious communication of Divine might or glory as being mediator, but by a real, though mysterious and ineffable, generation; and also to the Holy Spirit, who hath, from all eternity, proceeded from both, by an incomprehensible emanation or *spirationem*. Therefore the Father is justly held to be the fountain or original of the whole Deity.

3. The Son, therefore, and Holy Spirit, as to their real being or substance, are truly distinct from the Father; nevertheless, they are really partakers of the same Godhead and absolutely distinguished by the same Divine essence with the Father, which appears most evident from the holy Scripture giving them the same titles, and attributing to them the same properties as to the Father. Hence the Apostles' Creed on this subject, which we cordially believe, and whose declarations we adopt; that is, we "believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, &c.——And in the Holy Ghost, &c."

4. The above declarations are sufficient in relation to this holy mystery, a subject which we think it is expedient and becoming always to treat with modesty, prudence, and religious reverence; and we hold it to be the safest course, when speaking of this profound subject, to express ourselves, as much as possible, in the very words, and according to the mode and phrases in which it is presented to us by the Holy Ghost himself, seeing that the Spirit of God himself must best know himself, and is the most capable of stating and exhibiting his own nature and being; and so far as it was necessary to be declared and revealed, it has pleased him to reveal it to us. It is therefore especially becoming of us, that with reverence, humility, and devout feeling, we follow the mode thus presented to us of speaking on this subject, until we be permitted to see God face to face, when in the glory of that bright and celestial world, he will perfectly make known himself to us, amid the unclouded visions and manifestations of his being and will.

THE END.

66 411 A A 30

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DATE DUE

APR 18

DEC 10 1996

SEP 1 0

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 02020 2449